

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

Y. mer. 1875. Jan. 9. Libr

Through the General Convention to
 Milan. 1875. 1875

Geneva 1875. 1875.
 Jan. 9. 1875

J.D.d

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES

IN THE

GENERAL CONVENTION

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER, A.D. 1874,

AS REPORTED FOR "THE CHURCHMAN,"

BY D. F. MURPHY & CO.

HARTFORD, CONN.:

M. H. MALLORY AND COMPANY, PRINTERS.

1874.

GENESEE SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

BX
5820
-A3
1874

267.4
794.9
1874

11359

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
JAN 10 1874

INDEX TO SPEAKERS.

- Abercrombie, D.D., the Rev. R. M., of New Jersey, 19, 68, 109, 122, 401, 404, 410.
- Adams, D.D., the Rev. W., of Wisconsin, 19, 20, 35, 39, 42, 45, 51, 52, 72, 85, 86, 105, 106, 121, 160, 163, 173, 185, 189, 222, 226, 252, 261, 264, 272, 288, 290, 303, 314, 315, 319, 321, 324, 327, 336, 338, 345, 247, 348, 368, 371, 376, 380, 383, 388, 400, 401, 403, 405, 408, 410, 411, 412.
- Andrews, D.D., the Rev. C. M., of Virginia, 93, 144, 176, 187, 222, 224, 226, 252, 253, 255, 263, 274, 275, 285, 344, 345.
- Atwater, Mr. I., of Minnesota, 100, 151, 190, 217, 273, 280, 281, 310, 313, 315, 316, 317.
- Ayrault, D.D., the Rev. W., of Central New York, 54, 112, 113, 128, 129, 236, 247, 271, 272, 275, 374, 418, 419.
- Balch, Archdeacon, of Canada, 49.
- Baldwin, Mr. H. P., of Michigan, 72, 102, 103, 163, 222, 271.
- Barber, the Rev. S. P., of Easton, 113, 118, 119, 120.
- Bartholow, Mr. E. M., of Kansas, 194, 326.
- Battle, Mr. W. H., of North Carolina, 18, 96, 103, 126, 146, 161, 167, 186, 189, 190, 193, 222, 247, 278.
- Beach, D.D., the Rev. A. B., of New York, 14, 17, 53, 61, 64, 65, 72, 88, 92, 93, 133, 179, 277, 278, 300, 301, 369, 370, 374, 375, 380, 393, 395, 410, 417, 418, 419, 420.
- Beardsley, D.D., the Rev. E. E., of Connecticut, 40, 95, 96, 109, 111, 124, 147, 171, 223, 213, 276, 381, 413, 414.
- Beers, D.D., the Rev. H., of Wisconsin, 52, 70, 222, 229, 260, 284, 318.
- Benedict, D.D., the Rev. S., of Georgia, 62, 63, 154, 255, 260, 261, 262, 267, 320.
- Berkley, D.D., the Rev. E. F., of Missouri, 18, 20, 95, 102, 173, 175.
- Birdsall, the Rev. E., of California, 53.
- Blair, Mr. M., of Maryland, 87, 97, 103, 118, 121, 252, 258, 268, 271, 276, 279, 292, 303, 311, 313, 321, 325.
- Blanchard, Mr. E. W., of Maryland, 174, 205, 242.
- Bolton, the Rev. J., of Pennsylvania, 222, 229, 337, 338.
- Breck, D.D., the Rev. C., of Central Pennsylvania, 40, 172, 290, 345.
- Brown, D.D., the Rev. J. H. H., of Albany, 65, 90, 349, 402.
- Brown, the Rev. J. W., of Michigan, 89, 62, 98, 159, 186, 222, 281, 337, 338, 369, 379.
- Brune, Mr. F. W., of Maryland, 43, 181.
- Burgess, D.D., the Rev. A., of Massachusetts, 13, 33, 59, 104, 105, 107, 124, 126, 140, 145, 160, 163, 246, 247, 251, 267, 280, 316, 317, 338, 340, 352, 388, 397, 398, 400, 403, 420.
- Burgwin, Mr. H., of Pittsburgh, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 55, 56, 57, 58, 91, 105, 106, 108, 114, 121, 122, 124, 130, 131, 143, 146, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 168, 169, 176, 182, 188, 189, 194, 199, 209, 221, 222, 223, 245, 247, 250, 275, 277, 278, 279, 282, 289, 336, 337, 338, 348, 353, 357, 359, 360, 362, 363, 369, 370, 371, 375, 376, 392, 394, 397, 419, 420, 421, 422.
- Burr, D.D., the Rev. E., of Ohio, 44, 62, 78, 128, 320.
- Cady, D.D., the Rev. P. K., of New York, 69, 70, 71, 94, 174, 178, 193, 199, 221, 223, 264, 272, 273, 274, 277, 301, 304, 353, 363.
- Cass, Mr. G. W., of Pittsburgh, 61, 165, 388, 403.
- Chase, D.D., the Rev. S., of Illinois, 19, 166, 216, 217.
- Churchill, Mr. S. B., of Kentucky, 55, 61, 112.
- Clark, D.D., the Rev. J. L., of Connecticut, 222, 268, 333.
- Clark, D.D., the Rev. S. A., of New Jersey, 43, 90, 124, 172, 177, 216, 217, 236, 237, 238, 271, 293, 305, 369, 378, 408, 412, 421.
- Comstock, Mr. G. F., of Central New York, 16, 21, 25, 37, 53, 54, 56, 58, 70, 152, 157, 160, 161, 164, 165, 270, 274, 276, 278, 309, 313, 316, 327.
- Cooke, D.D., the Rev. S., of New York, 55.
- Coppee, Mr. H., of Central Pennsylvania, 101, 144, 254, 257, 258, 274, 275, 290.
- Corbett, D.D., the Rev. S., of Illinois, 63, 74, 360.
- Cornwall, Mr. W., of Kentucky, 22, 26, 98, 119, 126, 173, 250, 263, 273.
- Coxe, Bishop, 423.
- Crane, D.D., the Rev. W. C., of Mississippi, 89, 90.
- Crosdale, D.D., the Rev. J., of Easton, 112.
- Cuyler, Mr. G. W., of Western New York, 19.
- Dalzell, D.D., the Rev. W. T. D., of Louisiana, 61, 75, 92, 207, 222, 376.
- Daymude, Mr. J. L., of Iowa, 419.
- De Koven, D.D., the Rev. J., of Wisconsin, 40, 41, 42, 143, 175, 181, 182, 183, 199, 200, 205, 249, 254, 258, 259, 325, 333, 359, 361, 362, 363, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 373, 378, 380, 382, 390, 397, 404, 406, 417, 418.
- De Mill, Mr. P. E., of Michigan, 167.
- De Rosset, Mr. A. J., of North Carolina, 278, 336, 374, 393.
- Douglas, the Rev. W. K., of Mississippi, 37, 56, 174, 282, 355, 371, 383, 386, 397.
- Dudley, D.D., the Rev. T. U., Jr., of Maryland, 165, 359.
- Easton, the Rev. G. A., of California, 19, 27, 273.
- Edwards, the Rev. Mr., of Lichfield, England, 49, 92.
- Elliott, D.D., the Rev. J. H., of South Carolina, 267, 271.
- Fairbanks, Mr. G. R., of Tennessee, 122, 305, 307.
- Farrington, D.D., the Rev. W. G., of New Jersey, 15, 16, 19, 27, 28, 29, 31, 37, 44, 53, 59, 62, 70, 93, 122, 166, 180, 190, 191, 249, 251, 274, 319, 361, 372, 373, 381, 383, 393, 416, 418.
- Fish, Mr. H., of New York, 53, 113.
- Forsyth, Mr. J., of Albany, 275, 351.
- Fuller, Archdeacon, 48.
- Fulton, D.D., the Rev. J., of Alabama, 17, 18, 20, 21, 35, 43, 53, 60, 82, 83, 86, 96, 105, 121, 143, 164, 165, 179, 194, 198, 199, 205, 272, 274, 275, 291, 294, 298, 302, 303, 311, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 321, 322, 348, 349, 355, 370, 371, 373, 374, 375, 385, 388, 393, 394.
- Garrett, D.D., the Rev. A. C., of Nebraska, 231.
- Garrison, D.D., the Rev. J. F., of New Jersey, 92, 98, 295.
- Garthwaite, Mr. J. C., of New Jersey, 81.
- Geer, D.D., the Rev. G. J., of New York, 221, 357, 381, 418, 422.
- Geddes, the Rev. Dr., of Canada, 48.
- Getz, the Rev. H. S., of Pittsburgh, 189, 190, 222, 249.

- Gillespie, the Rev. G. D., of Michigan, 16, 93, 145, 166, 178, 189, 221, 310, 401.
- Girault, the Rev. J. F., of Louisiana, 64, 94, 100, 101, 271, 272, 273, 278, 313, 347, 349, 361, 382, 392, 394.
- Gray, the Rev. W. C., of Tennessee, 247, 315, 317.
- Gregg, Rev. F. M., of Illinois, 310.
- Hall, D.D., the Rev. C. H., of Long Island, 29, 30, 90, 91, 94, 121, 124, 129, 130, 131, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 148, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 165, 169, 175, 177, 183, 194, 236, 237, 244, 245, 248, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 261, 262, 266, 267, 268, 271, 272, 300, 301, 304, 305, 311, 313, 318, 319, 320, 324, 326, 327, 335, 336, 351, 352, 353, 355, 357, 358, 359, 361, 363, 366, 368, 369, 370, 374, 375, 376, 379, 380, 381, 387, 398, 413, 420.
- Haff, the Rev. F. R., of Wisconsin, 59.
- Hanchel, the Rev. J. S., of Virginia, 14, 16, 36, 37, 116, 117, 124, 131, 132, 173, 216, 221, 222, 267, 278, 291, 306, 307, 311.
- Haskins, D.D., the Rev. S. M., of Long Island, 18, 34, 390, 418.
- Harris, the Rev. S. S., of Louisiana, 68.
- Hayden, Mr. H. S., of Connecticut, 237.
- Hazlehurst, Mr. I., of Pennsylvania, 240.
- Henshaw, the Rev. D., of Rhode Island, 280, 281.
- Hopkins, D.D., the Rev. J. H., Jr., of Albany, 402, 404, 407, 415, 420, 421.
- Hubbard, D.D., the Rev. I. G., of New Hampshire, 64, 107, 140, 167, 360, 378, 379, 380, 381.
- Huntington, D.D., the Rev. W. R., of Massachusetts, 111, 254, 256, 257, 259, 267, 268, 273, 294, 295, 389, 394, 396, 397, 408, 410, 418, 419.
- Jenkins, Mr. C. J., of Georgia, 53.
- Jennings, the Rev. C. P., of Missouri, 90, 172, 250, 351, 353, 403, 404, 412.
- Johnson, the Rev. E. E., of Connecticut, 176, 265, 266, 282, 401.
- Kidney, D.D., the Rev. J. S., of Minnesota, 65, 81, 94, 163, 175, 249, 250, 268, 276, 318, 325, 391, 407, 415.
- King, Mr. J. A., of Long Island, 159, 181, 182, 192, 193, 222, 250, 252, 273, 275, 301, 302, 311, 313, 314, 338, 351, 359, 366, 368, 369, 370, 373, 381, 387, 395, 396.
- Kingston, Lord Bishop of, 47.
- Knickerbacker, D.D., the Rev. D. B., of Minnesota, 64, 90, 96, 410.
- Lamberton, Mr. R. A., of Central Pennsylvania, 20, 222, 322, 328.
- Leeds, D.D., the Rev. G., of Maryland, 64, 65, 80, 174, 251, 279, 281, 282, 302, 327, 409.
- Lewin, D.D., the Rev. M., of Maryland, 20, 26, 44, 60, 70, 107, 145, 149, 150, 156, 173, 175, 179, 180, 191, 222, 234, 235, 300, 311, 327, 336, 338.
- Lichfield, Lord Bishop of, 45, 91.
- Livingston, Mr. C., of New York, 14, 17, 18, 70, 71, 113, 141, 143, 144, 176, 217, 221, 262, 267, 272, 274, 300, 320, 335, 357.
- Locke, D.D., the Rev. C., of Illinois, 56, 112, 143.
- Mackall, Mr. R. C., of Easton, 187.
- Marks, the Rev. A., of Mississippi, 104, 375.
- Marple, the Rev. A. A., of Central Pennsylvania, 109, 112, 157, 165, 266, 338, 363, 370, 372, 379, 393.
- Martin, Mr. J. G., of North Carolina, 149, 310.
- Massie, Mr. N. H., of Virginia, 19, 54, 105, 247, 370.
- Matthews, Mr. N., Treasurer, 170.
- McCrady, Mr. E., of South Carolina, 13, 21, 97, 99, 152, 248, 272, 276, 278, 291, 296, 301, 314, 322, 324, 360, 361, 362.
- McCallough, the Rev. J. D., of South Carolina, 380.
- McIlwain, the Rev. R. C., of Iowa, 273, 403.
- McWhorter, Mr. G. C., of Central New York, 59, 419.
- Mead, D.D., the Rev. W. C., of Connecticut, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 27, 28, 34, 37, 41, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 85, 86, 87, 89, 92, 93, 94, 98, 100, 101, 107, 109, 112, 113, 120, 122, 158, 159, 172, 173, 177, 190, 192, 193, 252, 266, 268, 271, 274, 277, 311, 314, 318, 322.
- Meads, Mr. O., of Albany, 15, 16, 21, 29, 109, 176, 178, 179, 185, 275, 276, 335, 336, 355.
- Meigs, Mr. H., of New Jersey, 36, 37, 39, 50, 174, 193, 300, 308, 313, 336, 354, 407.
- Minnierode, D.D., the Rev. C., of Virginia, 25, 139, 176, 237, 326.
- Montgomery, Mr. T. C., of Western New York, 14, 16, 24, 25, 33, 40, 55, 57, 71, 72, 73, 74, 97, 98, 102, 103, 108, 123, 139, 143, 144, 145, 146, 156, 158, 160, 165, 166, 168, 174, 176, 177, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 199, 222, 315, 316, 324, 328, 338, 349, 362, 363, 372, 373, 374, 375, 380, 381, 383, 386, 387, 388, 392, 395, 396, 412, 414, 418, 419, 420, 421.
- Montreal, Lord Bishop of, 46, 112.
- Mudge, Mr. E. R., of Massachusetts, 273.
- Norton, D.D., the Rev. G. H., of Virginia, 61, 62, 77, 199, 240, 241, 298.
- Otis, Mr. L. B., of Illinois, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 32, 38, 39, 53, 59, 70, 74, 116, 167, 169, 188, 221, 260, 261, 272, 274, 275, 276, 291, 300, 352, 370, 396, 404, 405, 408, 411, 412, 413, 416, 421.
- Paret, D.D., the Rev. W., of Central Pennsylvania, 58, 70, 73, 74, 80, 81, 87, 191, 216, 217, 222, 245, 251, 267, 279, 281, 314, 345, 359, 372, 388, 391, 401, 411.
- Parker, Mr. R., of Virginia, 163, 174, 175, 176, 223.
- Payne, D.D., the Rev. W., of Albany, 140.
- Peirce, Mr. P. R. L., of Michigan, 68, 96.
- Perkins, D.D., the Rev. E. T., of Kentucky, 21, 53, 95, 105, 108, 112, 190, 222, 309, 328, 338, 351, 355.
- Pettis, the Rev. W. M., of Kentucky, 58.
- Pierrepont, Mr. H. E., of Long Island, 258.
- Pinckney, the Rev. C. C., of South Carolina, 111.
- Porter, the Rev. A. T., of South Carolina, 273.
- Potter, D.D., the Rev. H. C., Secretary of the House of Bishops, 422.
- President, The, 63, 66, 146, 154, 156.
- Quebec, Lord Bishop of, 47.
- Race, Mr. G. W., of Louisiana, 22, 28, 29, 50, 53, 57, 58, 72, 144, 222, 223, 273, 277, 315, 328, 361, 392.
- Reynolds, D.D., the Rev. C., of Kansas, 97, 98.
- Richardson, the Rev. W. R., of Texas, 112.
- Rockwell, Mr. H. B., of Central Pennsylvania, 421.
- Rogers, the Rev. B. A., of Texas, 19, 26, 27, 37, 56, 58, 59, 71, 72, 74, 78, 87, 91, 105, 106, 108, 120, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, 159, 177, 200, 278, 280, 281, 291, 312, 313, 315, 387, 402, 403.
- Rudder, D.D., the Rev. Wm., of Pennsylvania, 27, 81, 109, 131, 143, 144, 177, 178, 179, 199, 209, 212, 245, 256, 259, 267, 268, 326, 335, 337, 355.
- Ruggles, Mr. S. B., of New York, 18, 21, 24, 25, 56, 57, 62, 67, 68, 70, 110, 113, 280, 281, 310, 320, 321, 322, 324, 367, 407, 419, 420, 421.
- Runcie, D.D., the Rev. J., of Missouri, 114.
- Schenck, D.D., the Rev. N. H., of Long Island, 15, 26, 27, 30, 32, 53, 64, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 83, 88, 93, 108, 119, 123, 124, 129, 171, 172, 173, 174, 190, 193, 194, 221, 222, 247, 251, 271, 273, 301, 316, 323, 357, 364, 383, 396, 405, 406, 417, 418, 419, 421.
- Secretary, The, 12, 118, 216.
- Shattuck, Mr. G. C., of Massachusetts, 79, 90, 107, 122, 140, 213, 216, 221, 223, 251, 290, 300, 327, 328.
- Sheffey, Mr. H. W., of Virginia, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 70, 71, 73, 74, 81, 90, 97, 98, 99, 100, 115, 152, 156, 166, 167, 168, 550, 252, 254, 270, 271, 272, 291, 304, 313, 316, 319, 357, 369, 370, 371, 373, 374, 380, 383, 388, 391.

- Shelton, D.D., the Rev. W., of Western New York, 20, 36, 335, 420.
- Shipman, the Rev. J. S., of Kentucky, 36, 89, 95, 109, 124, 138, 168, 194, 218, 249, 302, 335.
- Smedes, D.D., the Rev. A., of North Carolina, 394, 418.
- Smith, Bishop, 422.
- Smith, Mr. J. M., of Western New York, 65, 218.
- Smith, Mr. J. J. P., of South Carolina, 97, 108, 143, 166, 173, 242, 272, 355, 363, 367, 375, 376, 386, 393, 396, 404, 415, 421.
- Spalding, D.D., the Rev. H. W., of Pittsburgh, 252, 275, 356.
- Stark, Mr. B., of Connecticut, 168, 254, 335, 336, 415.
- Stearns, D.D., the Rev. E. J., of Easton, 33, 58, 63, 64, 98, 108, 118, 119, 120, 179, 180, 185, 186, 189, 192, 193, 396, 412.
- Stephens, Mr. W. H., of Tennessee, 40, 275, 276, 277, 280, 313, 322, 338, 349.
- Stevenson, Mr. J. W., of Kentucky, 15, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 37, 52, 53, 66, 67, 74, 112, 120, 145, 146, 151, 154, 156, 157, 158, 165, 193, 222, 247, 313, 327, 359, 361, 410, 414.
- Stone, the Rev. J. A., of Delaware, 39, 96, 144, 185, 186, 192, 236.
- Stringfellow, D.D., the Rev. H., Jr., of Alabama, 173, 174, 307, 309, 313.
- Sullivan, D.D., the Rev. E., of Illinois, 87, 113, 293, 294.
- Taylor, Mr. T., of Virginia, 119, 153, 166, 169, 177, 186, 190, 192, 216, 218, 263, 275, 305, 315, 324, 353.
- Thompson, Mr. J., of Tennessee, 238, 247, 293, 304, 306, 313, 314, 315.
- Tozer, Bishop, 48.
- Trimble, the Rev. R. W., of Arkansas, 90, 97, 360.
- Van Deusen, D.D., the Rev. E. M., of Central New York, 74, 90, 94, 122, 126, 127, 128, 139, 218, 251.
- Vinton, D.D., the Rev. A. H., of Massachusetts, 69, 77, 143, 145, 199, 264, 272, 290, 336, 340, 342, 344, 345, 358.
- Ward, the Rev. J. H., of Maine, 271, 297.
- Watson, D.D., the Rev. A. A., of North Carolina, 89, 104, 105, 106, 172, 182, 183, 191, 199, 200, 250, 251, 265, 275, 278, 293, 303, 304, 305, 352, 353, 368, 369, 375, 387, 392, 393, 400, 401, 405, 406, 408, 411, 415, 416, 418, 419, 422.
- Waumdixun, H. W., of Niobrara, 67.
- Welsh, Mr. W., of Pennsylvania, 12, 17, 18, 26, 28, 34, 42, 43, 55, 65, 67, 71, 74, 86, 94, 95, 111, 113, 118, 120, 121, 122, 126, 130, 131, 132, 144, 145, 165, 166, 173, 174, 177, 179, 180, 183, 186, 187, 189, 191, 192, 193, 216, 217, 218, 249, 272, 274, 276, 280, 281, 282, 290, 291, 301, 305, 311, 316, 318, 328, 334, 335, 336, 348, 351, 353, 355, 362, 363, 377, 378, 382, 384, 385, 392, 397, 406, 409, 414, 417, 418.
- Wilder, Mr. E. T., of Minnesota, 18, 161, 164, 165, 200, 295, 367, 374, 387, 388.
- Whittle, Mr. L. N., of Georgia, 31, 36, 39, 52, 53, 70, 120, 131, 151, 152, 156, 158, 159, 162, 198, 213, 252, 268, 277.
- Williams, D.D., the Rev. W. C., of Georgia, 25, 26, 52, 53, 54, 63, 69, 73, 78, 118, 120, 176, 219, 299, 300, 307, 320, 336, 352, 363, 368, 397, 400, 404, 414, 416.
- Wilson, D.D., the Rev. W. D., of Central New York, 64, 160, 249, 284, 316, 337, 376, 377, 392.
- Woolworth, Mr. J. M., of Nebraska, 161.

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
ABANDONMENT OF THE CHURCH.....	176, 250, 407, 422
ABSENCE OF CLERGYMEN.....	166, 416
ALMS-BASIN PRESENTED TO ENGLISH CHURCH.....	128
ASSESSMENT ON THE DIOCESES.....	107
BAPTISM, INFANT.....	172, 285, 348, 351, 353
BAPTISMAL OFFICE.....	69, 93, 275, 329, 336, 340
BISHOP.....	
Officiating in other Dioceses.....	121
Provisional.....	93
Status of.....	123
Status of Missionary.....	417
Support of Missionary.....	139
Translation.....	194
Elect of Illinois and Wisconsin.....	19, 55, 71, 74, 117, 137
Elect, Testimonials of.....	
64, 98, 108, 165, 176, 179, 184, 192, 352, 466	
Testimonials of Bishop Adams.....	397
Testimonials of Bishop Orrick.....	340
Testimonials of Bishops Garrett, Elliott, and Wingfield.....	301
Missionary.....	164, 301, 416
Election of Missionary.....	260, 279, 302, 368
Election of Missionary, of China and Japan.....	172, 177, 328
Election of Missionary, of California.....	254
Election of Missionary, of Texas.....	254
Election Missionary, of New Mexico & Arizona.....	391
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.....	
Alteration of.....	71, 169, 358
French Translation.....	320
German Translation.....	376, 391
Italian Translation.....	417
Spanish Translation.....	284, 334, 392
Standard.....	382
Separation of Services.....	384
Shortened Services.....	69, 165, 171, 182, 260, 359, 396
Funeral Services.....	250
CALENDAR, THE.....	165, 166, 357
CANADIAN CHURCH.....	166
Delegation to Synod.....	139, 377
Intercommunion with.....	50
Relations with.....	109, 177, 238
Reception of Clergy.....	27
Farewell of Metropolitan.....	112
CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.....	189, 190, 222
CHAPLAINS OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.....	176
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.....	282
CHURCH CONGRESS, ENGLISH.....	18, 28, 61, 251
CHURCHES.....	
Erection of.....	127
Abroad.....	235
CHURCHMAN.....	
The Daily.....	397
Debates.....	419
CHURCH MUSIC.....	117, 118, 320, 352, 363, 382, 397
CLOSE OF BUSINESS.....	422
COMMITTEE ON CANONS.....	
Organization of.....	54
Reports of.....	
On Granting Seats to Secretary and Treasurer.....	54
On Memorials from California and Texas.....	59
On Dissolution of Pastoral Connection.....	89
On Organization of New Dioceses.....	89
On Removal of Communicants.....	89
On Testimonials of Bishops-elect.....	98
On Organization of House of Deputies.....	114
On Omissions and Errors in Digest.....	115
On Deputies from Missionary Jurisdictions.....	131

	PAGE
COMMITTEE ON CANONS (<i>Continue.</i>).....	
On Parochial Teaching.....	252
On Amending Canon 12 of Title I.....	270
On Change of Name.....	270
On Organization of Standing Committees.....	270
On Amending Canon 7 of Title I.....	270
On Testimonials of Bishops-elect.....	270
On Pastoral Charge in Theological Seminaries.....	270
On Santee Indian Reservation.....	304
On Amending Canon 4 of Title II.....	320
On Amending Canon 5 of Title III.....	352
On Inhibition of Accused Ministers.....	352
On Status of Missionary Bishops.....	353
On Candidates for Holy Orders.....	353
On Certifying Changes in Canons.....	353
On Missionary Bishops.....	368
On Canon "Of the Presiding Bishop".....	131
On Amending Canon 13 of Title I.....	131
On Court of Appeals.....	154
On Clergymen Charged with Offences.....	155
On Ritual.....	167
On Lay Readers.....	167
On Amending Canon 10 of Title II.....	172
On Theological Education.....	172
On Infant Baptism.....	182
On Shortened Services.....	182
On Organization of House.....	188
On Synods of Dioceses.....	199
On State of the Church.....	200
On Postures in Communion Service.....	221
On Divorce.....	221
On Abandonment of Communion by a Bishop.....	250
On Abandonment by a Clergyman.....	250
On Deaconesses.....	250
CONGREGATIONS OF A FOREIGN RACE.....	395, 420
CONSTITUTION.....	
Amendments.....	63, 269
Article V.....	59
" IV.....	276, 291
" II.....	174, 237, 358
" II. and III.....	63
Adoption of.....	90, 107
Commission on.....	65, 358, 419
CONTROVERSIES OF PARISHES.....	303
CONVOCACTION OF CANTERBURY.....	189
COURT OF APPEAL.....	56, 131, 133, 165, 169, 268, 358
CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.....	111
DEACONESSSES, ORDER OF.....	111, 250, 328, 408
DIOCESAN SYNODS.....	94, 406, 409, 417
DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.....	59, 89, 104, 108, 132, 304, 340, 392, 398
EUCCHARISTIC ADORATION.....	61, 172, 250, 403
EXAMINATION FOR DEACON'S ORDERS.....	96
FORCE OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS.....	329, 357, 382
FOREIGN VISITORS.....	20, 36
Reception of.....	45
Farewell to.....	91
FORM OF PAROCHIAL REPORT.....	220
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.....	93, 190, 249, 334, 348, 382
GOODWIN, THE REV. DR.'S, ILLNESS.....	335
HAIGHT, THE REV. DR.....	94
HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.....	319
HOUSE OF BISHOPS, MESSAGES FROM.....	
Notification of Organization.....	13
Greeting from English Church Congress.....	18
Joint Committee on English Church Congress.....	28

HOUSE OF BISHOPS, MESSAGES FROM (Continued).

Intercommunion with Canada.....	50
Committee to wait upon Lord Bp. of Lichfield..	59
Consenting to Division of Diocese of New Jersey.....	59
Non-concurring in appointing Joint Committee on Hymnal.....	67
Renumbering Canons.....	68
Amending Canon 13 of Title VII.....	68
Consenting to Division of Michigan.....	68
Consenting to Division of Ohio.....	68
Amending Canon 12 of Title I.....	106
Amending Canon 4 of Title I.....	106
Committee to nominate Board of Missions.....	106
Joint Committee on Standard Prayer Book.....	113
Amending Canon 13 of Title I.....	113
Amending Canon 2 of Title I.....	114
Amending Canon 6 of Title III.....	114
Committees on Canons to sit as Joint Com.....	114
Canadian Relations.....	114
Canon of Divorce.....	116
Report of Trustees Widows and Orphans Fund On Church Music.....	117
Reduction of Printed Journal.....	117
Returning Messages.....	131
Trustees Missionary Bishops' Fund.....	131
On Dissolution of Pastoral Connection.....	132
Transferring Santee Reservation.....	132
The Hymnal.....	132
Court of Appeals.....	133
Consenting to Division of Texas.....	135
Concurring in Board of Missions.....	154
Amending Canon 5 of Title III.....	154
Japan and China.....	164
Requesting Committee of Conference.....	177
Abandoning the Communion.....	187
Inhibition of Clergymen.....	187
Amending Canon 13 of Title I.....	188
Discipline of Communicants.....	200
Missionary Districts in Texas.....	200
Naming Joint Committee.....	216
Relations with Canadian Church.....	236
Missionary Districts in California.....	236
Discipline of Communicants.....	236
Organization of the House.....	236
Relief for Presiding Bishop.....	248
Missionary Bishop for Texas.....	254
Missionary Bishop for California.....	254
Standing Committee for Foreign Churches.....	270
Committee on Final Adjournment.....	270
Committee on Religious Reform Abroad.....	272
Standing Committee on Indian Affairs.....	275
Concurring in Boston for next meeting.....	279
Altering Article IV. of Constitution.....	291
Lectionary for Lent.....	300
Consenting to Division of Wisconsin.....	301
The Hymnal.....	301
Canon on Ritual.....	304
Organization of the House.....	304
Committee on Hymnal.....	311
Board of Missions.....	316
On the Hymnal.....	316
Committee of Conference.....	316
Concurrence in Messages.....	316
Centennial.....	319
Trustees of Relief Fund.....	320
Withdrawing nomination of Rev. Mr. Orrick.....	328
The New Hymnal.....	328
Order of Deaconesses.....	328
Force of Joint Resolutions.....	329
Concurrence in Messages.....	348
General Theological Seminary.....	348
Canon on Ritual.....	348
Church Music.....	352
Provisions for the Episcopate.....	352
Missionary Districts.....	352
Russo-Greek Church.....	376
Committee on General Theological Seminary.....	382
Committee on Ecclesiastical Relations.....	382
Standard Prayer Book.....	382
Force of Joint Resolutions.....	382
Commission on General Theological Seminary.....	382
Committee on Final Adjournment.....	382
Trustees of General Theological Seminary.....	382
Standard Bible.....	382
Church Music.....	382
Lectionary for Lent.....	387

PAGE

HOUSE OF BISHOPS, MESSAGES FROM (Continued).

Time of Final Adjournment.....	387
German Prayer Book.....	391
Bishop of New Mexico and Arizona.....	391
Concurrence in Messages.....	395
Congregations of a Foreign Race.....	395
Shortened Forms of Prayer.....	396
Amendment to Article 8 of the Constitution.....	396
Closing Services.....	406
Clergymen chargeable with Misdemeanor.....	406
Committee Service.....	406
Information asked.....	406
Synods of Dioceses.....	417
Title of House of Deputies.....	417
Italian Prayer Book.....	417
Commission on the Constitution.....	419
Asking Conference.....	421
Non-concurrence in Messages.....	421
Abandonment of the Communion.....	422
Concurrence in Messages.....	422
HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.....	
Election of President.....	12
“ Secretary.....	13
Appointment of Assistant-Secretary.....	18
Appointment of Standing Committees.....	19, 54
Rules of Order.....	18, 21, 28, 37, 51
Appointment of 2d and 3d Assistant-Secretaries.....	26
Reception of Foreign Visitors.....	36
Appointment of Joint Committee on Hymnal.....	62
Supplementary Delegates.....	89, 124, 176, 194, 268, 358
Report of Treasurer.....	89
Election of Treasurer.....	90
Farewell to English Visitors.....	91
Farewell to Canadian Metropolitan.....	112
Secret Session.....	112, 114, 116, 124, 132
Night Sessions.....	118
Report of Committee on Representation.....	121
Deceased Members.....	124, 141
Statement of Treasurer.....	170
Representation of Dioceses.....	95, 168
Reduction of Number of Deputies.....	62, 121, 320
Place of Next Session, 174, 177, 191, 194, 215, 272, 279	
Change of Name.....	165, 412, 417
Final Adjournment.....	420
Sessions of.....	
First Day.....	9
Second Day.....	18
Third Day.....	36
Fourth Day.....	54
Fifth Day.....	65
Sixth Day.....	88
Seventh Day.....	109
Eighth Day.....	113
Ninth Day.....	114
Tenth Day.....	116
Eleventh Day.....	118
Twelfth Day.....	124
Thirteenth Day.....	132
Fourteenth Day.....	132
Fifteenth Day.....	138
Sixteenth Day.....	168
Seventeenth Day.....	186
Eighteenth Day.....	215
Nineteenth Day.....	249
Twentieth Day.....	279
Twenty-First Day.....	301
Twenty-Second Day.....	324
Twenty-Third Day.....	368
Twenty-Fourth Day.....	397
HYMNAL, THE.....	
Memorial.....	27
Joint Committee.....	62
Committee on.....	67
Discussion on.....	64, 132, 141, 165, 254, 260, 271, 301, 311, 316, 328, 335, 357, 382
INDIAN AFFAIRS.....	186, 275, 302
Santee Reservation.....	132, 270
JOURNALS.....	
Republication of Early.....	303
Reduction of Printed.....	117, 121, 140, 377
LAMBETH CONFERENCE.....	71, 78
LAY READERS.....	109, 167
LECTIONARY, THE NEW.....	393
LEAVE OF ABSENCE, 21, 90, 117, 138, 168, 218, 249, 302, 335	
LESSONS FOR LENT.....	78, 92, 133, 277, 300, 305, 368, 389
LETTERS FROM THE EASTERN CHURCH.....	329

PAGE

	PAGE		PAGE
LICHFIELD, LORD BISHOP OF.		RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED (Continued).	
Opening Sermon.....	9	On Ritual.....	248
Message in regard to.....	59	Of acknowledgment to Canon of Ely.....	252
MCLIVANE, DEATH OF BISHOP.....	128	On transfer of Santee Reservation.....	270
MEMORIALS PRESENTED.		Adopting Boston for next meeting.....	274
From Wisconsin, concerning Nicene Creed.....	19	Amending Canon 13 of Title I.....	276
From California, for Establishment of Mission- ary Jurisdiction.....	19	On Nicene Creed.....	276
From Texas, for Division of Diocese.....	26	Continuing Joint Com. on Christian Education.....	284
From Pennsylvania, regarding Hymnal.....	27	Continuing Committee on Spanish Prayer Book.....	284
From Mississippi, concerning Nicene Creed.....	56	Discharging Committee on Reprint of Early Journals.....	303
From Other Dioceses, on Same Subject.....	56	Thanks to Trinity and Holy Trinity Churches.....	305
From Wisconsin, for Division of Diocese.....	59	On the Hymnal.....	316
From Virginia, on Ritual Uniformity.....	61	Amending Article 5 of the Constitution.....	319
From Massachusetts, concerning Baptismal Service.....	69	Complying with request of Centennial Com.....	320
From Arkansas, on Ritual.....	90	Concerning organization of Churches abroad.....	320
From New Jersey, on Ritual.....	92	Adopting Canon "Of Church Music".....	320
From Kansas, on Ritualism.....	97	Amending Article 5 of the Constitution.....	327
From Connecticut, concerning Nicene Creed.....	111	Paying Presiding Bishop \$250 per year.....	328
From Texas, on Hymnal.....	112	On the Hymnal.....	335
From Same, on Court of Appeal.....	112	Commission for General Theological Seminary.....	350
From Kentucky, on Ritual Uniformity.....	112	Adopting Canon on Ritual.....	376
From Easton, concerning Nicene Creed.....	112	Providing Shortened Form of Prayer.....	376
From Kentucky, on Ritual.....	126	On Russo-Greek Church.....	383
From Tennessee, for Amendment of Article 5 of the Constitution.....	127	Printing Canon in the Hymnal.....	387
From New York, on Ritual.....	141	Fixing Time of Final Adjournment.....	397
NEW YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY.....	117	On the Lectionary.....	397
NICENE CREED, THE.....	56, 124, 276	Of Thanks to M. H. Mallory & Co.....	408
ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED BY CHICAGO FIRE.....	26	Concerning Abandonment by a Bishop.....	408
PAPERS IN REGARD TO DR. SEYMOUR.....	516	Amending Canon 6 of Title II.....	412
PASTORAL LETTER.....	419, 423	Changing Title of the House.....	416
POINTING OF THE PSALTER.....	64, 140, 378	Amending Canon 1 of Title III.....	417
PRAYER FOR RULERS.....	404	Of Thanks to the President.....	417
For authorities.....	173	Appointing Committee on Italian Prayer Book.....	417
PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.....	65, 252, 363	Of Thanks to the Secretary.....	417
PROVISION FOR THE EPISCOPATE.....	352	Of Thanks to the Rev. Dr. Mead.....	419
REMOVAL OF COMMUNICANTS.....	62, 89, 107	Of Thanks to the Postmaster.....	419
REMOVAL OF MINISTERS.....	168	Ordering bound copies of Debates.....	421
RESIDENCE OF THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS.....	418	Of Thanks to Assistant Secretaries.....	421
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.		Amending Canon 2 of Title II.....	422
On Appointment of Standing Committees.....	16	RITUALISM.....	60, 61, 92, 97, 141, 155, 166, 174, 194, 200, 223, 237, 251, 252, 270, 275, 304, 311, 316, 336, 348, 349.
Of Compliment to the Lord Bishop of Lichfield and others.....	20	Remarks of the Rev. Dr. Leeds on.....	331
On Admissions to the Floor.....	20	RUBRICAL REVISION.....	291, 384, 387
On Lambeth Conference.....	71-88	RULES OF ORDER.....	13, 16, 21, 28, 37, 51
Of Sympathy with Dr. Haight.....	94	Proposed Committee on.....	107
Appointing Rev. C. R. Hale on Joint Commit- tee on Standard Prayer Book.....	100	Amendment of.....	122
To pay \$500 toward expenses Presiding Bishop.....	107	Committee on.....	167
To pay Secretaries' Salaries.....	107	RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE.....	303, 376
To assess Dioceses.....	107	SECRETARY.	
Thanks to Trinity Church.....	107	Election of.....	13
Consenting to Division of Ohio.....	116	Assistants.....	16, 18, 36, 132
Consenting to Division of Michigan.....	117, 131	And Treasurer, Privileges of.....	28
Confirming Trustees of Miss. Bishops's Fund.....	122	Salary of.....	107
Electing Board of Missions.....	137	SENTENCES OF SUSPENSION.....	109
On Discipline of Communicants.....	166	STANDARD BIBLE.....	368, 382
Numbering of Canons.....	166	STATE OF BUSINESS.....	397
Clerical change in Canon 10 of Title II.....	167	STATE OF THE CHURCH.....	122, 200, 218, 404
On reference of Messages.....	168	STUDENTS IN SEMINARIES.....	416
Limiting debate to thirty minutes.....	176	SYNODS OF DIOCESES.....	199, 249
Changing hour of meeting.....	177	THANKS.	
Relations with Canada.....	177	To Trinity Church.....	107
Appointing Committee on Religious Reform abroad.....	182	Resolution of.....	305
On Organization of House.....	189	To Secretary Perry.....	417
On Relief for Presiding Bishop.....	194	To Rev. Dr. Mead.....	417
		To Postmaster and Others.....	419
		To Assistant-Secretary.....	421
		UNFINISHED BUSINESS.....	140

DEBATES

IN THE

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

NEW YORK, 1874.

FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, October 7.

The first Wednesday in October, being the day designated by the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America for holding a General Convention, the Bishops and the Deputies-elect assembled, agreeably to the appointment of the last General Convention, in this city, in St. John's Chapel, Trinity Parish.

Processional Hymn, 202, Hymnal—"The Church's one foundation."

Morning Prayer was begun by the Rev. William Stevens Perry, D.D., Secretary of the last House of Deputies.

Venite.

The Eighth Selection of Psalms was read by the Rev. Edward James Edwards, Vicar of Trentham, Diocese of Lichfield, England.

The First Lesson (Isaiah lx.) was read by the Very Rev. Lewis P. W. Balch, D.D., Archdeacon of Huron.

Te Deum.

The Second Lesson (John xvi.) was read by the Rev. J. Ellegood, M.A., Canon of Montreal.

Jubilate.

The Creed and Prayers to the Litany were said by the Rev. W. Q. Ketchum, D.D., Honorary Canon of Fredericton, New Brunswick.

The Litany was read by the Rev. Henry C. Potter, D.D., Secretary of the House of Bishops.

Hymn 25, Prayer-Book, "I love Thy Kingdom, Lord."

The Communion Service was begun by the Right Rev. Ashton Oxenden, D.D., Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada.

The Epistle was read by the Right Rev. William R. Whittingham, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Maryland.

The Gospel was read by the Right Rev. Reginald Courtenay, D.D., Bishop of Kingston, Canada.

Anthem, Mendelssohn's *Elijah*: "If with all your hearts you truly seek Him," by Rev. W. H. Cook.

The Sermon was delivered by the Right Rev. George Augustus Selwyn, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Lichfield, England.

SERMON.

Acts xv. 28.

It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us :

ἔδοξεν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἀγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν.

Confer. Acts xv. 28.—It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord :

ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν.

Acts xv. 22.—Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas :

τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν.

Acts xv. 2.—When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them.

γ. 2.—Dissension disputation disputing.
στάσις ζήτησις γ. 7, συζήτησις

γ. 4.—They were received of the church and of the apostles and elders :

παρεδέχθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.

γ. 6.—The apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter.

γ. 23.—The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting :

οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, χαίρειν.

Behold, brethren, a Synod in the highest sense : "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"—God the Holy Ghost uniting believers with Himself by the spirit of counsel. St. Paul tells us in 1 Cor. iii. 9, that we are laborers together with God, and he adds : "Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building." The world is the field in which God works with us : He as the Lord of the harvest ; we as the laborers. The Church is the building growing into a holy temple (Ephes. ii. 21), in which God is the master builder, and we the workmen. As Christ is both the priest and the sacrifice, so He is both the master builder and the chief corner-stone. And we, in like manner, are both the workmen and the stones—workmen to lay ourselves as living stones upon the one foundation, which is Christ alone, in whom we are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit (Ephes. ii. 22). In this character of "laborers together with God,"

Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem, and there declared to the Church and to the Apostles and elders all things that God had done with them (Acts xv. 4). So also at Antioch they rehearsed all that God had done with them (Acts xiv. 27). The final words of St. Mark's Gospel are thus seen in their course of fulfilment; "They," that is, the Apostles, "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them" (Mark xv. 20).

United work is the result of united counsel. There must be one mind before there can be one work. When the builders of Babel could not understand one another's speech, they left off to build the city (Gen. xi. 8). Not so when the Lord builds the house. The labor will not be lost of them that build it (Psalm cxxvii. 1). As the master builder God lays the foundation, and gives grace to them that build upon it (1 Cor. iii. 10). Many names may be given to that special grace. It may be called unity or the spirit of counsel, but its special name is edification (1 Cor. xiv. 26). Let all things be done unto edifying.

The rule by which we work is the mind of the Master-builder. The plumb-line (Amos vii. 7), the measuring-reed (Ezekiel iv. 3), and the square are the Lord's. The pattern of things on earth was first conceived in heaven. The foundation on which we build was laid by the foreknowledge of God. He that built all things is God (Heb. iii. 4).

It was no part of the creed of the Apostolic Church that every man might build upon this foundation as he pleased. It was not enough to say, "I build upon the foundation of Christ;" whether he built gold, silver, and precious stones, or wood, hay, and stubble (1 Cor. iii. 12). A plain warning was given: "Let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon," for "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is (ib. iii. 13). There was no place for rival bands of builders. This was the earnest exhortation of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1. 10), when he heard that there were contentions among them:

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

No man had a better right to assert an opinion of his own than St. Paul. He had been called, from his mother's womb; he had seen the Lord Jesus Christ; he had heard the voice of the Lord speaking to him from heaven; he had been caught up into the third heaven to hear unspeakable words. If he had claimed to the uttermost the right of private judgment and rejected all counsel of his brethren, he at least, if any man, might have been excused. But this was not the mind of the Lord Jesus as the Lord Himself had revealed it to him; this was not the way along which the Holy Ghost led him; this was not the lesson which he learned and practised at the Synod of the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem; this was not the example which he saw and followed when he was received, late in the day, as one born out of due time, into that church in which the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul (Acts iv. 32). The thought was thus deeply rooted in the Apostle's mind, that "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace" (1 Cor. xiv. 33).

The right of private judgment was not abolished, but placed under due control. Each believer might have his own special gifts by which one man would differ from another; to one, the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge; to another, faith; to another, the gifts of healing; to another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another, divers kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues;

all these were the work of that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he would. These special gifts, like the powers of foot and head and eye, were for the good of the whole body. There was to be no schism in the body; but all the members were to have the same care one for another. Each member of Christ was free to covet earnestly the best gifts; to pray for more knowledge and more faith, and more inward and spiritual life, yet all these would be of no avail, without that more excellent way of charity, that bond of perfectness, which unites all the several members in the one body.

Private judgment and free expression of opinion were not forbidden in that Synod of Jerusalem. What is a Synod but an assembly of men of many minds, and what would be the value of a Synod if there were not freedom of speech? The Apostolic Church was not exempt from differences of opinion; it was not a Church bound to accept as infallible the opinions of one man. Grecians were free to murmur against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. The converts to the circumcision were free to contend with St. Peter, because he went in to men uncircumcised and did eat with them; others of the converted Jews, in their zeal for the law, taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. St. Paul did not fear to withstand St. Peter on the same ground, face to the face, because he was to be blamed; there was no small dissension and disputation upon the point at Antioch; much disputing on the same question at Jerusalem; certain of the sect of Pharisees which believed gave their opinion that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law. Peter, Paul, Barnabas, took the contrary side; and St. James, as president, summed up the debate and put the question to the vote; and then by the united voice of Apostles, Elders, and brethren, the decree was given, and the encyclical letter written with the solemn preamble:

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

Can we fail to learn from this inspired history what the right of Private Judgment really means? It means the unfettered right of every man to have his own opinions and to express them freely, but to be ready to give way to the opinion of his brethren, and to accept their decision, as if it were his own. It does not mean the audacious assertion of personal infallibility: it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to me: but it does mean that to every believer a power is given, to some more, and to others less, to search the Holy Scriptures; to pray for the guidance of the Spirit; to seek the mind of Christ; to compare spiritual things with spiritual; to be fully persuaded in his own mind; and yet withal to know himself to be but man, finite, fallible man, still far from perfection, still an Apostle who with all his gifts may require to be taught the way of God more perfectly, still a Peter who may deserve to be withstood. All this his own private judgment, rightly used, will teach him. I cannot be as God, knowing all things; can I assume to myself the grace of infallibility, which I deny to the head of two-thirds of Christendom, and deny it because he, as the successor of St. Peter, claims a power which St. Peter himself did not possess: are the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which I have received, so much more abundant as that I should be more certain of freedom from all error than they, who heard the words of Him who spake as never man spake; and upon whom the Ghost came down on the day of Pentecost to teach them all things, and to guide them into all truth? And when the holy and humble man of heart goes, in this frame of mind, into the Synod of his Church, and sees Bishops, Priests, and brethren assembled there "with one accord" (Acts xv. 25) in the name of the Blessed Trinity; when

solemn prayer has been offered up for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, not upon one but upon all; when the Holy Communion of the body and blood of Christ has united all the members in the one body of their Lord, what will be the word of counsel which the Private Judgment of each member in particular will suggest to his mind? Will it not take its form in thoughts like these: What am I, in the midst of these gifted men? If I have searched the Scriptures, so have they. If I have prayed for the guidance of the Spirit, so have they. If I have walked with God, much more have they. I am the least of all these holy men. There are men here at whose feet I am not worthy to sit. I thank God that I am not left to trust to the conclusions of my own deceitful heart, for surely in this multitude of counsellors there is greater safety.

True it is, that times have been, and may be again, when one man may stand alone in the midst of an apostate world. Abraham stood alone when he interceded with God. Athanasius stood alone against a world of heresy. Even in heaven it may be true, as the poet has feigned, that some seraph Abdiel

"was faithful found;

Among the faithless, faithful only he."

But of all the spirits that require to be tried whether they be of God, this spirit of championship needs the greatest caution. It was no true assumption which made Elijah say, "I, even I only, am left" (1 Kings xix. 10).

But what saith the answer of God unto him (Romans xi. 14): "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men which have not bowed the knee to Baal."

What greater temptation can there be to pride than for a man to believe himself to be a defender of the faith when he stands up before his brethren as the champion of some peculiar opinion? It is thus that the unity of the Church is rent, when men say, "I am of Paul," and "I of Apollos," and "I of Cephas," and "I of Luther," and "I of Calvin," and "I of Wesley," and "I of Simeon," and "I of Pusey." But what saith the Holy Ghost?

"Is Christ divided?"

As children who have sailed their boats in the pond in their father's garden are filled with astonishment when they go down to the sea in ships and there see the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep, so the man who has lived in the narrow precincts of his own mind, and measures all things by his own standard of thought, is amazed to find how little he really knows when he comes into the assembly of men older, wiser, more holy, and higher in station than himself. His feelings will be those described by Isaiah (lx. 5): "Thine heart shall fear and be enlarged, because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee." He is as one that has launched out into the deep. He had fished in shallow waters; now he lets down his net into a sea that cannot be fathomed. How partial now seem those which he called his views; how imperfect that which he called his private judgment; the vessels which he drew with did not reach to the depth of Christ's love; his mete-yard could not comprehend that love, the measure whereof is longer than the earth and broader than the sea (Job xi. 9). But now he comes to his Synod, to learn the way of God more perfectly, to seek the mind of Christ by counsel with his brethren; to pray with them for the knowledge of that fulness of the Saviour's love which passeth knowledge until it be comprehended with all his saints (Ephes. iii. 19). The soul escapes as from a prison in which a single ray shone upon it through a narrow chink, true light, it may have been, from the one true and only Sun, but still a single ray; but now in the fellowship of kindred souls, in the hallowed interchange of spiritual counsel, in united

prayer, in frequent communion, the light shines upon him from every side mirrored upon the minds of all with whom he walks as friends in the house of God. Feelings unknown before, thoughts which never came into his mind, new views of doctrines, new applications of Holy Scripture, a wider range of spiritual sight—these are the ever growing and ripening fruits of a life of sympathy and communion with those whom God has united together in the mystical body of his blessed Son. The whole character of his mind is changed. He has come like a hermit out of his cell to impart to his brethren the answers which God has given to his lonely prayers, and to receive back again from them an hundred-fold the gifts of grace and visions of glory which have been shed abundantly upon the Synod assembled with one heart to pray for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The conceit of private judgment is swallowed up in the full assurance of the conviction which has been brought home to the minds of all. The words once so pleasant and so customary:

This is *my* view:

—give place to the soul-sustaining decision, which resolves all doubts, appeases all differences, and edifies the body of Christ (Ephes. iv. 12):

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

How will the promise be fulfilled, that the Holy Spirit will teach us all things, and bring all things to our remembrance, whatsoever Christ has said unto us (John xiv. 26). How will the Spirit of Truth guide us into all truth? (John xvi. 13.) Are we making progress towards that end? We are compelled to answer that we are not advancing. This state of religious strife in which we live cannot be the mind of Christ, the Prince of Peace. It is not thus that we can keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. What one asserts and another denies cannot be the teaching of the spirit of truth. This is not the way by which we shall be guided to the knowledge of all truth. The truth of God must be one. There can be no more contention, when we have once found the truth. It is no use to say that we agree in the essentials of the truth. So much the more grievous is it that we should quarrel about trifles. But trifles they are not. Every particle of the truth of God is precious. It must be searched out like the one grain of gold hidden in a bucketful of sand. It is all truth that we seek, and not partial truth; truth in doctrine, truth in prayer, truth in every motive, truth in every action of the Christian life. There must be no compromise with truth; no saying that one opinion or one rule of life is as good as another. If I differ from a fellow-Christian in any single point however small of Christian doctrine or practice, I ought not to rest until I have found out whether he be wrong or I.

This is what the world calls bigotry, and why? Because the world cares nothing for the truth. It prefers the belief that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, to the doctrine that it is only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved. We, on the contrary, can never cease to pray that we all perfectly know the Lord Jesus Christ to be the way, the truth, and the life. What they despise as dogma is that which we seek as truth. We contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints (Jude 3).

How must we contend? Not with strife and ill-will, but with mutual forbearance. Stormy debate and angry recrimination are the bane and the disgrace of the Synods of the Church. Leave them to the world to which they belong, though even in the civil assemblies it is an unseemly thing that they who profess to govern others should be unable to control themselves. But in a Christian Synod, in which we pray for the presence of the Holy Ghost, the tone must be, not as of those who contend for

victory, but of those who seek for truth. Hush! broilers, hush! the Dove has lighted in the midst: take heed lest she again unfold her wings, and flee away to be at peace.

That Holy Spirit who spake by the Prophets and Evangelists comes in answer to the prayers of the faithful, to guide them to the true interpretation of that Word of life, which, though it be plain to the simple, yet contains hard sayings which "they that are unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction" (2 Peter iii. 16). Was there ever any heretic who did not profess to base his doctrines, however erroneous, upon the letter of Holy Scripture? The true office, then, of the Synods and Conventions of the Church is to pray for the grace of the Holy Spirit to enable them to search the deep things of God. We have the Holy Bible in our hands; each one of us is free to read; free to seek the promised blessing, that they who search the Scriptures shall find; but still the fact remains, that whether it be from prejudice, or self-deceit, or defect of prayer, the readers of the same Word differ in opinion widely one from another. Can all be right? or, according to the current phrase, shall all agree to differ? Oh! no. It is truth that we seek. To acquiesce in error is to give up the search after truth. God has set his bow in the cloud to teach us that the refracted rays of many colors must be made to converge again. Men of narrow opinions and partial views must blend together in one those partial glimpses of the truth which each has mistaken for the whole. When party spirit, like the dark cloud, shall have passed away, and with it the many colored rays of religious opinions; then will truth of doctrine shine forth, like the face of our transfigured Lord, shining as the sun, and like His raiment white as the light.

That focus of the scattered rays of light has ever been in the Holy Synods of the Church. How glorious were those days in which the Holy Ghost poured down the spirit of counsel upon an undivided Christendom. Think what we, as descended from Gentile forefathers, owe to the Apostles, Elders, and brethren, for that decree, which seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to them:

"Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." In consequence of that decree, we have been brought out of darkness and error to the clear light and true knowledge of God and of His Son Jesus Christ.

Think again what we owe to the Council of Nicea, where all the diverging questions, "What think ye of Christ?" were gathered into one by the voice of the Holy Ghost speaking through the Bishops of the Universal Church:

"We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, God of God, Light of Light."

Was the Spirit lost when the Churches of the East and West were rent asunder? Oh! no. The Lord has said that "He will be with His Church always." True it is that a divided Christendom cannot pray for the gifts of the Holy Ghost with the same full assurance as if every prayer went up to heaven from a multitude of believers still of one heart and one soul. But the privilege which belongs to united prayer may still be exercised, though with abated confidence, by a Church like ours, which it has pleased God to extend far and wide over the face of the earth and among the islands of the sea. Her prayers never cease day nor night. Her bishoprics are one hundred and sixty. I will not say that a Church like ours can decide questions of doctrine with full authority like that of the undivided Church; but until the time shall come, in the counsels of God, for that reunion of Christendom for which we devoutly pray, the prayers of such a branch of the Church as ours cannot fail to procure for us a large

measure of the gifts of the Spirit, if only we agree together as to what we shall ask of the Father. The same desire for unity which brings you together in your General Convention will much more lead us to look forward to another meeting of the Lambeth Conference, to seek more carefully for the mind of Jesus, and to pray more earnestly for the Holy Ghost to heal the divisions of our Church.

"Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded; and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing."

The offertory was received by the Right Rev. Alfred Lee, D.D., Bishop of Delaware.

The Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant was said by the Right Rev. Alfred Lee, D.D., Bishop of Delaware.

The Major Exhortation was said by the Right Rev. William M. Green, D.D., Bishop of Mississippi.

The Minor Exhortation was said by the Right Rev. Thomas Atkinson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina.

The Confession was said and the service was continued by the Right Rev. Horatio Potter, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Bishop of New York.

The Trisagion and Sanctus were sung by Rev. W. H. Cooke.

The Right Rev. B. Bosworth Smith, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Kentucky, and presiding in the House of Bishops, then proceeded with the Prayer of Humble Access, Consecration, and Administration of the Holy Communion.

The Post Communion was said by the Right Rev. Thomas M. Clark, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Rhode Island.

Gloria in Excelsis.

The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. Samuel A. McCoskry, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Michigan.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

The members of the House of Bishops having retired to the rooms assigned them in the church building,

The Rev. WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, D.D., Secretary of the last House, called the House of Deputies to order.

Each Diocese was called in alphabetical order, and the Deputies elected therefrom presented their testimonials.

The SECRETARY then called the roll, and the Deputies present answered to their names.

The SECRETARY (on the conclusion of the roll-call). I hereby declare that the Church is represented by a majority of dioceses, agreeably to Article I. of the Constitution of the Church.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that we proceed to elect a President.

The motion was agreed to.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD. I now nominate the Rev. James Craik, D.D., of Kentucky, President of the last House, to be President of this present House of Deputies of this General Convention.

The SECRETARY. The Rev. Dr. Craik is nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the balloting be dispensed with, there being no other nominations.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

The SECRETARY. The question now is on the motion that the Rev. Dr. Craik be elected President of the House.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

The SECRETARY. I appoint the Rev. Dr. Mead and Governor Stevenson to conduct the President to the Chair.

The Rev. Dr. CRAIK, on taking the Chair, said : Brethren, I thank you with all my heart for this renewed expression of your confidence. I had hoped that the burdens of this office would have been placed upon a younger and more capable person ; but the counsel of friends in whom the Church is accustomed to confide, and the kindly voice which you have just uttered, have determined otherwise. I accept the duty, and will try to perform it in the fear of God, looking to Him for grace and strength, and looking to you to kindly forbear with my increasing infirmities.

We have come together from this broad land to confer with one another upon the momentous interests, the ever-momentous interests, of Christ's Holy Church ; to remove obstructions in its way, if we find any ; to provide facilities for its progress, if we may ; to see to it that this holy city of our Lord receive no detriment. Grand and inspiring is this duty, demanding wisdom, firmness, charity, true love to God and man, true love to mistaken impugnors of the truth, as well as to those whom we deem its fastest friends. I am sure that you will perform this duty manfully, fearlessly, looking to God for help, for wisdom, for direction. May the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of wisdom, love, and power, guide you, strengthen you, sustain you in all your work ! Amen.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that we proceed to the election of Secretary, and I nominate the Rev. Dr. Perry.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House proceed to the election of Secretary, the present Secretary being nominated as part of that motion.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

RULES OF ORDER.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I offer the following resolution :

Resolved, That the rules of order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, as proposed to be amended and reported at the last General Convention and printed in the Journal as appendix 16, No. 2, on pages 621, 622, and 623, be adopted as the Rules of Order of this House, except that the Committee on Canons shall consist of 19 members instead of 13, as therein provided, the proportion of clergymen and laymen thereon to be left to the discretion of the President of this Convention.

Mr. MCCREDY, of South Carolina. I am opposed to that, and I will give my reasons. I have read those rules, but I doubt whether many gentlemen here have read them. I think they are an improvement on the rules adopted at the last House ; but the exception that is made I object to.

The proposition now is to enlarge the Committee on Canons to 19. Will 19 work any better than 13 ? I think not. You have power in the Committee on Canons, as now organized, to divide itself into two and make two committees : One on Canon Law, and the other on the Constitution. At present you send all these subjects (whether they be constitutional or whether they be only legislative) to one committee. Now that is not the proper way, because it tends in itself to confound subjects, and the committee is sometimes in doubt as to whether a subject ought to be presented by Canon or otherwise. I have seen that more than once, and I have known things to be done which would not have been done if there had been two committees, one on the Constitution and one on the Canons. Now, if you look at the work which is brought before us, you will see that we do not have legislation simply at our sessions, but we have many schemes brought before us which affect the organic constitution. Take for instance the provincial system. That is prominent before us at this time.

That ought to go to a standing committee, not a special committee—that would take its place in order and be called before special committees. If you succeed in getting the same committee and divide it into two, making each a committee of thirteen, one on the Constitution and one on the Canons, you will find that your work will go on quite as fast as it can go on if you have but one committee. Committees when they are so large as nineteen—

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman will please give way that we may receive a message from the House of Bishops.

NOTIFICATION OF ORGANIZATION.

The following message (No. 1) was received from the House of Bishops by the hands of the Rev. Dr. POTTER, its Secretary :

The House of Bishops informs the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution :

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to inform the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies that this House is organized, and has elected the Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, D.D., of the Diocese of New York, as its Secretary, and is ready to proceed to business.

On motion of Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts, a committee of two was ordered to be appointed to inform the House of Bishops that the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies has organized and elected its officers, and is ready to proceed to business.

Rev. Dr. Burgess, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Meads, of Albany, were appointed the committee.

RULES OF ORDER.

Mr. MCCREDY, of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. I would suggest that, in consequence of the message we have received from the House of Bishops, we postpone this resolution in order to pass a similar one to be sent to the House of Bishops to that which we have received from that House, informing them of our organization.

Mr. MCCREDY, of South Carolina. I would be very glad if this could be postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. If the Deputy from South Carolina will give way, I will move that this resolution be printed and made the special order for to-morrow. I concur in most that the Deputy from South Carolina has said. The Committee on Canons did very well when we had 12 or 15 dioceses. Now we have over 40. Momentous questions come before this body as the Dioceses increase, and I think no better way can be had to reach the views of the honorable deputy from South Carolina than to refer this resolution to a committee of so many clerical and so many lay deputies, who shall report whether we want any additional committees and such amendments to the rules as will meet the general sense of the Convention. I am satisfied that great amendments are required in these rules. I am satisfied it is unjust to put upon any single committee the duties which now devolve upon the Committee on Canons ; and, as these immense questions come before this Convention, we ought to have committees of discreet and able men who shall give the various subjects their consideration and report such rules as will carry out the end. That can only be done by a reference of this resolution to a committee. Let it be printed to-day, referred to-morrow, and let us have a speedy report, and adopt the suggestions which a wise committee may make.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Conn. I fully agree with the gentlemen who have spoken, and I agree with

them not theoretically but practically. I have had a great deal of experience upon the Committee on Canons, and I am certain that the legislation of the Church will be better conducted by dividing the Committee, or having the Committee on Canons as it is now a Committee on Canons, consisting of 13, and appointing a new committee for the purpose of considering all proposed constitutional amendments. I therefore hope that the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will prevail.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Let this resolution lie on the table.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD. If we want rules of order, we must adopt them to-day; but we can to-morrow make a new rule of order which shall refer to a standing committee all proposed alterations or amendments to the Constitution; and that is covered by the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I yield with great deference to what my venerable and experienced friend from Connecticut says; but I think the proper way to reach the thing at the root is to refer, and I move now to refer this resolution to a committee of five clerical and five lay deputies.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I did not hear what the reverend gentleman from Connecticut said; but I would suggest, as it is proper for us to have settled rules to begin with, that it would be better to take the rules as reported by the Committee of the last General Convention, as they are now printed in the Journal where every member can see them, and then have this other question, which I think is a very important one, discussed afterward. We must have a set of rules to begin business with. I therefore second the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that we adopt the rules as they appear upon the Appendix to the last Journal, and then let the matter be referred either to a special committee or to the Committee on Canons, and I would prefer the latter Committee, because they are more familiar with the subjects that come before them and with the necessities for an increase of their number, than any special committee can be in the short time they will have to consider the matter. And I propose, therefore, that the whole subject be referred to the Committee on Canons, to report immediately to this House such rules of order as may strike them as proper for the convenient transaction of business.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I suggest that the question may be divided, and the first question taken on the adoption of the rules without regard to enlarging the Committee on Canons. That would relieve us from all embarrassment. The ordinary committees will be announced to-morrow. A division being called for, we shall take the question on the first resolution; and there is no objection to it. The other point I care nothing about just now.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. We ought to proceed with deliberation and care. I therefore move the appointment of the delegation of New York to see if we cannot find a better room to deliberate in. It is impossible here.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Before that motion is put it is perhaps proper that the deputies from New York should be heard, that they may state why this building was selected. It has been selected for many years as the best and most appropriate building for the Diocesan Convention.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman is discussing a subject foreign to the one before the Convention.

The PRESIDENT. I think so. I was about to say that the proposition made by Mr. Hanckel was entirely out of order, and could not be considered until we dispose of the question as to the rules of order. The question now is on the adoption of the rules of order as reported by a Committee at the

last Convention, printed in the Journal, and now appearing there as Appendix 16, No. 2.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I moved an amendment. I presume the first question that comes up is on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT. Yes; but I understood Judge Otis to say that you had agreed to let the question be divided, and take it first on the main proposition to adopt the rules. I would suggest to Judge Otis to withdraw his exception.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I withdraw the exception, and that leaves it simply a resolution to adopt the rules of order.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I withdraw, then, my amendment, with this understanding: that no committees will be appointed in this body at all until the rules have been adopted.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The usual practice after the election of officers is to adopt the rules of the last Convention as the rules of this Convention until they are amended. I would remind the gentlemen also of the fact that the rules of the last Convention are not the rules proposed at present to be adopted; but they were referred to a committee of three, and that committee reported, and by a vote by dioceses and orders, the rules reported were adopted as the rules of order of the General Convention by a large majority. It would be wisest for us to adopt them now, and then, if you want any amendments to-morrow, it will be proper to introduce amendments. But there are various committees which ought to meet to-morrow. Otherwise we are losing a day, and time is too precious for us to lose when we have so much apparently to come before us. I move, therefore, that the resolution offered by Mr. Otis, of Illinois, be adopted, that the rules of order of the last Convention be the rules of order of this Convention.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to make an enquiry. What do the rules of order provide as to a change in the rules? If we adopt these rules of order as proposed, a modification of any committee will be a change of the rules. Do the rules limit the right of the Convention to change them by requiring a day's notice? Are we at liberty as much to make a change as we are to adopt these rules now?

The PRESIDENT. There is nothing in the rules concerning that matter.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Then we can amend at any time?

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Yes, sir.

The Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. It is important to know what rules of order we are to adopt. Are they the rules printed in the Journal of 1871, as of the thirteenth day's proceedings? As I understand, they were not acted upon at the last Convention, but a motion was made that they should be deferred to be acted upon at this Convention. That action will be found under the proceedings of the nineteenth day.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The last Convention could not pass rules for this Convention. Every Convention adopts its own rules. This Convention now may adopt the rules of the last Convention.

The Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. The question I wish to get at is this: In adopting the rules of order of the last Convention, do we adopt the rules of order printed under the proceedings of the thirteenth day?

The PRESIDENT. The resolution specifies which set of rules we adopt—specifies that it is the set contained in Appendix 16, No. 2. Number 1 is the old rules under which we acted last time; Number 2 is the new rules reported by the Committee; and the question now is whether we shall adopt these new rules.

The Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I think members of the House all understand that the rules governing the last Convention were the rules of 1868, and the rules printed as No. 2 of Appendix 16 are simply proposed rules lying over from the last Convention into this; so that, if we vote to adopt the rules of the last Convention, we adopt the rules of the Convention preceding, which we acted under at the last Convention; while the second part of Appendix 16 consists merely of proposed rules, printed for the consideration of members during the recess, to be acted upon at this session.

The PRESIDENT. But it is now proposed to adopt those rules, and the question is on the resolution offered by Judge Otis, adopting the rules proposed at the last House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Withdrawing the exception as to the Committee on Canons?

The PRESIDENT. That is withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I want the House to understand what the question is, for I think it is a very important one. Are we voting on the proposed rules that were not acted upon three years ago, or are we adopting the rules which governed this Convention at its last session?

The PRESIDENT. The new rules.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. On the proposed rules?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I call for the reading of the resolution of the deputy from Illinois, as amended. That will explain the whole thing.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as it now stands modified.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies as proposed to be amended and reported at the last General Convention, and printed in the Journal as Appendix 16, No. 2, on pages 621, 622, and 623, be adopted as the rules of order of this Convention.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. That amounts to a resolution which will put in force a body of new rules which have never yet been in force in this House, and rules that nobody has had any opportunity that I am aware of, except by reading the Journal, to know anything about. I therefore move now to amend the resolution, by adopting the rules of order which were in force at the last Convention until otherwise ordered by the House; and, having done that, we can take up these new rules at our convenience, and adopt them, if necessary, as a substitute for the old ones. It seems to me that the true thing to do, under the present circumstances, is to take up the body of the old rules in force at the last Convention, and afterwards we can act upon any amendments to them.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I hope the motion just made will not be carried. The Committee that reported these rules was composed of the Rev. Dr. Mead, Rev. Dr. Haight, and Judge Sheffey. A more experienced Committee could not possibly have been selected in this House. They took the question under advisement, reported on the thirteenth day of the last session what rules they recommended, adopting substantially all the rules of the former House, with four or five important additions. That report was not acted upon finally, because of the late season at which the rules were reported, but by vote of the House they were directed to be printed in the Journal for the examination of the members who might be here to-day, so that they could act intelligently upon them, and thus obtain at an early period of the session (which of course is a very important matter), a set of rules carefully devised by a competent committee, such as that of which I have spoken. I will state for the information of the House, that I have examined very carefully the rules as reported by the Committee, and compared them with the old rules. Almost all the old rules

are adopted in the new, but they are systematized and arranged in better order, because the old rules had grown up year by year, as a kind of patch-work, without any order or arrangement. This Committee applied those rules and arranged them systematically, in the first place, and they then made, I believe, substantially five changes, of which I have made a note.

In the first place, they provide for the appointment of Committees. Previously the appointment of the standing committees of the House had been by resolution; but now, by Rule 4 of the revised rules, it is made the duty of the President to appoint the regular standing committees, with the addition of one on memorials of deceased members.

In the second place, they provide for a calendar, to be made out by the Secretary of the House, upon which all motions, resolutions, and reports shall go down in their order, to come up in their order for discussion, which calendar is to be taken up every day at 12 o'clock, unless there be a special order which would take its place.

In the third place, it is provided that upon all nominations sent down from the House of Bishops for Missionary Bishops, this House shall sit with closed doors.

The next addition is, that where a matter is brought before the House with a view to its being referred to committee, no debate shall take place upon the question of reference; but it shall go to the Committee, reserving debate until the Committee has been heard from, so as very properly to prevent two discussions or two debates on the same subject-matter.

In the next place, where an amendment is offered to a matter pending before the House, a motion to lay that amendment on the table can be carried without carrying the whole subject-matter. Under the usual parliamentary law, where a question is before the House and an amendment is moved, if any one move to lay that amendment on the table, that motion being carried, the whole subject-matter is carried with it, sometimes to the very great surprise of the House, who have just given the vote. This alteration of the rules provides that such a motion may be made, where an objectionable amendment is moved, and when carried the original matter still remains before the House, as if that amendment had not been moved.

These, I believe, are the substantial changes which the Committee, from their experience, thought proper to suggest for the adoption of the House, so that if we agree to the motion of the lay gentleman from Illinois, the effect will be simply to adopt the old rules, with the additions I have now stated to the House.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I wish to call attention to another change which the gentleman has not pointed out; but it may have been an accidental omission on the part of the printer. According to Rule 19 of the last Convention, two amendments were allowed, an amendment and an amendment to an amendment, and then a substitute for the whole matter. In the proposed rules of order that clause is thrown out. It says, "No after amendment to such second amendment shall be in order." Nothing is said about a substitute. Now, the question is whether a substitute will still be in order?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I think under the general parliamentary law a substitute is always in order after there have been two amendments.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Why not have it so stated in the rules of order?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I cannot say what reason induced the Committee to leave it out, but probably it was because they thought it unnecessary.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. That is already the law, and there is no necessity for repeating it. You can always move a substitute.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Very well.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. There is one other amendment which I omitted to state, and that is that no new business shall be introduced after the 13th day, unless upon a vote of two-thirds of the House.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I desire to say a single word. I have as much respect for the opinion of the learned Deputy from Pittsburgh as anybody else. He tells us that he has read these rules. Who else has read them? They were proposed by the last Convention to this. Is it wisdom for this Convention to take rules that they have not looked at? Is it parliamentary to take rules that you have never looked at? Suppose the learned deputy from Pittsburgh has read them; suppose half a dozen others have read them; I want to read them, I want to reflect upon them. I suppose other gentlemen want to reflect upon them. There is always wisdom in multiplicity of counsel, and there might be other amendments which might be suggested.

Now, why not adopt the old rules that we have been acting under, and let this subject come up for debate to-morrow? That is usual. Even in the statement, for which the Convention is obliged to the learned gentleman from Pittsburgh, he omitted some of the proposed changes, and we have difficulties already as to whether a substitute is, under general parliamentary law, always in order or not. Ought not that to be considered? Why not. As these rules were referred to this Convention, and as this Convention is the only body that can adopt them, as this Convention is the body to be regulated by them, is it not usual, proper, and parliamentary to let this report come up for consideration to see whether it is perfect, and if not perfect, that it may be made so by amendment, and let us to-day simply adopt the old rules? That seems to me wise, and sanctioned by parliamentary law. I hope this Convention will only to-day adopt the old rules, and let this subject of proposed changes come up afterwards.

One word further. The learned deputy said that the rules had been revised by distinguished gentlemen. I agree with him. I know two or three of those gentlemen, and I would confide myself any subject of rule-making to them; but even the work of that Committee is to-day shown not to be perfect by the recommendation made by the learned Deputy from Illinois to increase the Committee on Canons from 13 to 19. That shows that the members of this Convention had not yet considered the subject fully, and I beg gentlemen on both sides to agree that we shall to-day simply adopt our old rules, and not make haste too fast in adopting new rules that the members of the Convention have not even read or heard.

I move to amend the resolution by simply adopting to-day the old rules.

The PRESIDENT. That is the motion before the House made by Mr. Meads, to amend the resolution offered by Judge Otis by adopting the old rules.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I withdraw my amendment if it has been moved already.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I think it would be better if all these resolutions were withdrawn, and we proceeded as we did at the last Convention to authorize the President to appoint certain committees and afterwards provide for rules. Meanwhile we are under the usual parliamentary rules. When we meet to-morrow we shall be under those rules as a body.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I think this amendment would meet both views: that

we adopt these rules provisionally until we can make some that we are satisfied with. The usual order in such cases is to adopt the rules of the last House "until otherwise ordered by this House." I move to amend by striking out all after the word "Resolved," and putting in the words "until otherwise ordered by this House."

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. That was part of my proposed amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Then I do not see that we shall gain anything by adopting one set more than another if the reservation is contained in the body of the resolution that we may change the rules when we have more intelligence in the subject; and as between the two, those which have been proposed by a committee who have given the subject careful consideration, and those which have been acted upon by this Convention formerly, I think the House would much prefer the intelligent result of an examination by a committee. I hope therefore the original resolution will not prevail.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I have never read these rules.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The question is on adopting the old rules of order, I understand?

The PRESIDENT. The first question is on the amendment of Mr. Meads to adopt the old rules as the rules of this House, until they are amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move now, as there is no provision made in the old rules for the appointment of committees, that the following resolution be adopted:

Resolved, That the President appoint the following Standing Committees: 1st, A Committee on the State of the Church, to consist of one member from each diocese; 2d, a Committee on the General Theological Seminary; 3d, on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society; 4th, on the Admission of New Dioceses; 5th, on the Consecration of Bishops; 6th, on Canons; 7th, on Expenses; 8th, on Unfinished Business; 9th, on Elections; 10th, on the Prayer-Book; 11th, on Christian Education, and 12th, on Memorials of Deceased Members, each, except the first, to consist of thirteen members.

The Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I move to amend by adding, "except the Committee on Canons, which shall consist of nineteen members."

The PRESIDENT. That introduces the matter which gentlemen wanted to defer the discussion of until to-morrow. I hope the amendment will not be pressed.

The Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution of Dr. Mead.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES OF ORDER.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I move that the rules of order reported at the last Convention be made the special order of this House for to-morrow, at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

The SECRETARY announced the appointment of the Rev. William C. Williams, D.D., of the Diocese of Georgia, as Assistant Secretary.

PLACE OF MEETING.

The Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I rise to renew the motion I sought to make a while ago, and the confusion of to-day shows the absolute necessity of it. I noticed that the Chair was obliged to

put a motion twice because the House did not understand the question. Just now the delegate from Connecticut proposed the appointment of a committee, and, before he took his seat, another gentleman, half a dozen pews off, proposed to do just the same thing. It seems, therefore, that we are going to do business several times over in this House if we attempt to go on in a place so utterly unsuited for deliberation. I am satisfied that this is not a proper hall for deliberation. Where I sit not a syllable has been heard of what many speakers have said. I move that it be referred to a committee of three of the New York delegation to enquire whether we cannot find, in the city of New York, a place better adapted for the deliberations of this body.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Livingston) referred to this building having previously been the general house of meeting. I grant it; but since we met here before a chancel has been added, and the sound is entirely destroyed. I would just as soon go back to Trinity Chapel as stay here. I would propose that the committee should consist of lay gentlemen to enquire and report whether we can get "the little church around the corner" again. That is the place I want to go to. Members are located in that direction, and if we meet where they will stay there during the sittings; but we have to come two or three miles down-town to this building.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I ask gentlemen to give it a trial of one day.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. We have had a trial of half an hour already, and scarcely an individual can hear my voice, though it sounds like thunder. [Laughter.] I do not want to exhaust my lungs at the age of nearly eighty.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Mr. President and Gentlemen, before you decide that you will not have this house, I ask you to hear from the delegation upon whom you devolved the duty of providing a house for you. You say that this room is unfit. It will not do for us to deny it; but have you tried it? I think not. This building was provided for the religious services of this morning, and it was supposed that very little of the business of the Convention would be attempted to be done to-day after the religious services were performed. It was intended to prepare the seats appropriated for each delegation, which has not been done, so that to-day the delegates are all mingled up; but that matter will be looked after as soon as an adjournment is had. It was intended to provide rostrums, and they are ready, so that members desiring to address the House in any lengthy remarks may stand in a position where they may be heard with ease by members in any part of the House. You have not yet tried this. If you go into another church building, you must go to one that is large enough to receive and accommodate not only the Deputies to this Convention, but very many persons who have come from a distance to attend as spectators and auditors. You must have a building sufficiently spacious to receive and accommodate them. This building was selected not only as an auditorium, but on other accounts. It was the duty of the delegation from New York to provide accommodations for the Bishop, and a building adjoins this chapel which is admirably adapted for that purpose. Committee-rooms had to be provided, and they are ready at hand. One gentleman suggests to me that a lunch-room was needed. It is ready at hand, and arrangements have been made to provide a lunch for the Bishops and for the Deputies every day. Then we have here committee-rooms conveniently at hand. Perhaps there are better auditoriums in the city than this, but I know of no

building that commands all the advantages of this. It was the decided opinion of our revered and very efficient colleague, Dr. Haight, that this was almost the only building in the city of New York adapted for the purposes of this Convention.

Now, gentlemen, of course we have no objection to your searching the city, and I trust you may find a better building; but my opinion is that you had better go on with what you have got, and give it at any rate a trial for to-morrow, and then send out a committee and search through the city if you are not satisfied.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Allow me to ask the deputy from New York, while he has the floor, whether it would not be possible to have a curtain put over the recess of the channel? Twelve years ago when we sat here, we had not the difficulty which has been experienced to-day. An attempt has been made to improve the hearing capacities of the hall by wires across the ceiling, and yet there are difficulties which we did not experience twelve years ago, but it may be that we have become old and feeble, and that our voices are weak; but there are some young men here, and I fear they would find difficulty in being heard.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. If the Convention are decidedly disposed to accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that matter could be arranged within a day or two. Undoubtedly, this House ought to have the best auditorium that can be found in the city. The delegation from New York believed that this was the best; but if a majority of the Convention think that a better one can be selected, surely we shall make no objection to your doing it.

In regard to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will say that that matter was considered, and it was stated by some members who attended one of the former Conventions that the curtain did not avail for the purpose intended, and that therefore it was not worth while to provide a curtain now. I will state that men worked all night one night to construct the wires which gentlemen see under the ceiling. It was stated that an invention of that kind had been tried in two or three rooms in the United States, and also in a cathedral abroad, and had been found to work successfully in improving the acoustic properties of the building. I am sorry to say that I do not think it has been a success here. The attempt was made, however. If it is the decided opinion of the body that a curtain should be placed in front of the chancel, it will be prepared as soon as it can be.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The argument is very simple; twelve years ago, we had not the difficulty that we experience to-day. The change that has been made has been in the chancel. If the gentleman says the New York delegation will try the experiment of a curtain before it, I hope the resolution will not be pressed.

The Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I move that this question be postponed until two o'clock to-morrow. The New York delegation evidently have made very great efforts to accommodate this body. It is, however, perfectly apparent that persons can be heard here only with great difficulty. The suggestion that there be a rostrum, at which members who intend to speak at any considerable length may stand, will probably remove that difficulty. Then, when we consider the very great kindness of our New York friends, I think we ought to stay in the building provided for us, if it can be made sufficiently convenient. Certainly, I think the *argumentum ad hominem*, which is a knock-down argument commonly, is ten times as strong when it assumes the phase of the *argumentum ad stomachum*; and hence I think that after lunch to-morrow we shall be in a humor to meet

this question candidly and fairly. [Laughter.] My motion is to postpone the consideration of the subject until two o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I suggest that we try to-morrow's session in this hall.

The Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The Lay Deputy from New York suggests to me to move to postpone until Friday morning, so that we may try this hall to-morrow. I accept that suggestion and make that motion.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I would remind members that the principal discussion which has taken place to-day has been in a narrow circle immediately around the Chair, and the gentlemen who have spoken, with scarcely an exception, have faced the Chair, so that they spoke from the great body of the delegations in this house, and that was one reason why they could not be heard. Another difficulty has been, though I do not mean to criticise, gentlemen, that it has certainly not been uncommon to-day that more than one has been speaking at the same time. I believe that does not facilitate hearing very much. [Laughter.] I suppose that between now and the hour of assembling to-morrow morning the seats of the delegations from the several dioceses will be set off for them, or at all events so marked that each delegation will know its own place. The effect of that will be that the gentlemen who most prominently and most frequently address the Convention will be distributed all through the house, and some system will be adopted. It does seem to me that we are acting quite prematurely when we act upon the hypothesis that we cannot be heard successfully in this house as twelve years ago we were heard here. I believe when we get into working order, and the Deputies of the respective dioceses are seated together in their assigned places, and gentlemen have accustomed themselves to the acoustic qualities of this building, we shall get along very satisfactorily.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is anything before the House now?

The PRESIDENT. A motion to postpone.

The Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. I move that the proposition for the appointment of a committee to procure another place of meeting be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. That motion takes precedence. The motion was agreed to.

ENGLISH CHURCH CONGRESS.

The following message (No. 2) was received from the House of Bishops:

The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has received the following communication by cable telegraph: "Presiding Bishop General Convention, New York. Church Congress of the Church of England, assembled at Brighton, greets the General Convention, and prays that, through the Divine blessing on its deliberations, union between the Churches of America and England may be strengthened." (Signed) Bishop of Chichester.

And that it has unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the despatch received from the Bishop of Chichester, conveying the greetings of the Church Congress at Brighton, England, to the General Convention, be communicated to the House of Deputies, and that, if that House concur, a joint reply be sent to the Bishop of Chichester, communicating our hearty thanks and the assurance of our best wishes for the success of their meeting.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move the concurrence of this House in the action of the House of Bishops, and that a committee of three be appointed to unite with the House of Bishops in sending a reply.

The motion was agreed to; and Rev. Dr. SHELTON of Western New York, Rev. Dr. BURGESS of Massachusetts, and Mr. LIVINGSTON of New York, were appointed the Committee.

FAMILIES OF DEPUTIES.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That one of the galleries be reserved for the families of Deputies.

I will state that this is the usage; but the Committee did not feel free to reserve a gallery without the action of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. We have already done more than the ordinary business of the first day of the session. I move, therefore, that this House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the House adjourned.

SECOND DAY.

THURSDAY, October 8.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at 10 A.M.

Morning Prayer was said by the Right Rev. Henry Adams Neely, D.D., Bishop of Maine, assisted by the Right Rev. Alfred Lee, D.D., Bishop of Delaware.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Rev. Dr. HASKINS, of Long Island. The Secretary announced yesterday that he had appointed the Rev. William C. Williams, D.D., of the Diocese of Georgia, First Assistant Secretary. That nomination was not confirmed by the House. I now move the selection of Dr. Williams by the Secretary as his Assistant Secretary, be confirmed by the House.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE HALL.

The PRESIDENT. There is one matter which I suggest to the House should precede the ordinary conduct of business. Communications from the President are first in order, and I am prepared to announce some of the committees; but the Deputy from New York who is taking care of us here wishes to make some explanation at once with regard to the arrangements of the House. Will the House hear that explanation now? ["Yes."]

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the rules of order be suspended for that purpose.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. The deputation from New York desire to make an explanation, or, perhaps, an apology, for not having their arrangements perfected, as it was thought they would be, yesterday. Orders were given for the construction of a curtain, to be hung in front of the chancel, and as it involves two or three hundred yards of sewing, and requires many women to work pretty much all night, the curtain has not been finished, but it is expected that it will be finished by to-morrow morning. Then as to the rostrums, which were intended to be used—one in front of the President's chair, as is the one where I now stand, and the other near the bar, at the lower end of the middle aisle, so as to give facilities at both ends of the room—they have been, to a certain extent, condemned by gentlemen who have looked at them, and orders have been given for the construction of a small stage in front of the President's chair; that also will be prepared to-morrow morning. I trust, therefore, that gentlemen will exalt their voices somewhat more to-day (if they speak from their seats and condemn the rostrums), so that they may be heard a little more distinctly. I think that, by gentlemen rising and turning partially towards

their fellow-members in the House, they will be heard with more distinctness than by turning their faces toward the Chair. The seat of the Chairman has been advanced beyond where it was yesterday, and I think now there will be no difficulty in hearing the Chair during the whole day. If, however, it should be found that it requires a sounding-board at the rear of the Chair, that will be constructed after it shall be ascertained that the present arrangements are insufficient.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT. I have worked on the committees, and have not been able to quite finish them. I have only been able to take the list of Deputies as printed. If in any delegation there are gentlemen mentioned on the committees who will not be here in the early part of the session, or not at all, the delegation will be so good as to inform the Chair, and let a change be made in the committee.

The Secretary read the list.

The PRESIDENT. There are two committees not yet filled. I worked up to the last hour with the assistance of a friend, and this is all that I could accomplish. There are some one or two mistakes I see in this list, by which a few persons are on two committees. I will try and correct that with the Secretary.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. I move that the Secretary be instructed to have 500 copies of the list of members and standing committees of this body printed for the use of the members. It is unnecessary to discuss this motion. It is the usual course adopted for the convenience of members.

The PRESIDENT. That is a very proper thing, and I will receive the motion, unless there be petitions and memorials to be offered to the House. If there are no petitions or memorials, we pass to motions and resolutions.

Rev. Dr. CHASE, of Illinois. I have a memorial or paper in the nature of a memorial.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will receive it.

BISHOPS-ELECT.

The Rev. Dr. CHASE, of Illinois, presented the testimonials of the Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D., as Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Illinois, which were referred to the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops.

The Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin, presented the testimonials of the Rev. Dr. Edward R. Welles, D.D., as Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops.

MEMORIALS.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin, presented a memorial adopted at a Council of the Diocese of Wisconsin, asking the General Convention to take measures toward securing for use in divine worship an English Version of the Nicene Creed, as conformable as may be to the original text, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

The Rev. Mr. EASTON, of California, presented a memorial of the Diocese of California for the establishment of two missionary jurisdictions in that diocese; which the Secretary proceeded to read, but was interrupted by—

The Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I rise to a point of order. Is it necessary that all memorials be read? It seems to me we are establishing a precedent if we go on reading them. We may have memorials presented which it would not be desirable to have read.

The PRESIDENT. The reading will be a matter of course, if those who offer memorials desire to

have them read, unless the House rules to the contrary.

The Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT. The reading will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the memorial, and having proceeded for some time was interrupted by—

Mr. CUYLER, of Western New York. I hope the reading will be dispensed with, and the memorial referred to the proper committee, and printed in the Journal, where it will meet the notice of the House. I suggest that memorials of this kind be referred by the Chair to the appropriate committee without debate.

The PRESIDENT. That cannot be done without an order of the House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Committee on Canons is the proper committee to which it should be referred.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to refer the memorial to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I wish to say a word about the reading of this memorial. I desire that the Convention should not refer these memorials to the Committee without their being read. They go to that Committee as memorials and never come before this Convention again. As memorials they are reported upon, and you take the judgment of the Committee. But this case of California and one or two others are cases peculiar. They come here for a special law and special action which has never been had heretofore. Their reasons rest upon the grounds stated in the memorial, and they are peculiar. I hold in my hand a memorial which I desire this House to hear, exactly in accord with the one now being heard. Therefore, I hope the reading of the memorial of California will be finished, and that then the memorial of Texas will be read, and that any other memorials that come here asking special action upon special grounds will be heard by the House. You are the ultimate body to act, and you should know our reasons, and not take them second-hand from a committee.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. The memorial must be read if any member demands it.

The PRESIDENT, *pro tempore*. (Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia, in the chair.) That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. Would it not accomplish the purpose infinitely better to have the memorial referred and printed? I assure the Deputy from Texas that gentlemen hear with so much difficulty in different parts of the House that we do not catch what is desired in reading a memorial. We cannot understand it sufficiently to base any intelligent action upon it. It seems to me we should save a vast deal of time by referring all these memorials to the appropriate committees, and, if they be of sufficient importance, letting them be printed and placed in our hands in printed form. Not one-tenth of the members of this House know anything intelligently about the memorial from California that has been partly read. I move, therefore, a general resolution that all memorials be received, read by their titles, and referred to the appropriate committees, and, where they are deemed of sufficient importance to justify it, printed and distributed through the House.

The Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I should be glad to expedite business, but I would like that the matters contained in these memorials should come to the knowledge of this House. I am very fearful that they never will be printed, and if printed never read as they should be.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. That is the very point I am anxious about, to get to our knowledge the contents of these memorials. I have had no intelligent

knowledge of the California memorial so far as it has been read, and I think that is true of everybody around me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* The Chair will rule that it must be read.

Mr. LAMBERTON, of Central Pennsylvania. It can very readily come to the knowledge of the House after the report of the committee.

The Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I call the gentleman to order. Has not the President decided the point?

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. I believe we have at twelve o'clock a special order, which takes precedence of everything.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* It does.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I ask that the rule be enforced, and that we proceed to the consideration of the special order, the hour of twelve having now arrived.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I move that the special order be suspended for a moment for the purpose of passing certain resolutions of courtesy.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* The question is on suspending the rules to permit the introduction of resolutions of courtesy.

The motion was agreed to.

BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND OTHER VISITORS.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I offer the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a joint committee, consisting of four on the part of this House, be appointed to wait upon the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, and convey to him the expression of their very great satisfaction at his presence again in our midst, and of their deep obligation for his able and most admirable sermon preached at the opening of this General Convention.

"Resolved, That the Lord Bishop be requested to furnish a copy of the same for publication by the Convention."

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I cannot vote for that first resolution, inasmuch as I did not hear the sermon, and I believe a great many persons in this church did not hear it. I can vote for a resolution requesting a copy of the sermon, without any qualification, to be published; but now I am called upon to vote that it was an admirable sermon. Not having heard it, I cannot pronounce upon it; nor do I think this House is required to do that. I think the compliment should be in asking for the sermon to be published. We pronounce no opinion on our own Bishops when they preach sermons to us; but we merely order their sermons to be published. All we need do in this case is to ask for a copy of this sermon to be published; but it is not consistent to express an opinion on it when I have not heard it, and many of you have not heard it. If you strike out all that is matter of opinion, I will go for the resolutions with all my heart; but I cannot vote to admire anything that I do not understand and have not heard.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolutions of the Deputy from Central Pennsylvania.

The resolutions were agreed to; and Rev. Dr. Breck, of Central Pennsylvania; Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Massachusetts; Mr. Waite, of Ohio; and Mr. Race, of Louisiana, were appointed the committee.

Rev. Dr. SHELTON, of Western New York. The resolutions just adopted left out something, which I beg leave to add by offering this:

"Resolved, That this House expresses its great gratification at the attendance of the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, the Metropolitan of Canada, the Lord Bishop of Quebec, the Lord

Bishop of Kingston, and of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Niagara, Dr. Fuller, the Venerable Archdeacon Balch of Huron, the Rev. Dr. Geddes of Ontario, the Rev. Dr. Ketchum, Honorary Canon of Fredericton, the Rev. Edward J. Edwards, Vicar of Trentham, England, and other English and Colonial clergy present; and that a committee be appointed to invite the Bishops and the other clergy named to attend the sessions of this body, and that they also arrange the time and manner of their first reception by this House."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I move to amend that resolution by adding, "and any priests or other clergymen of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution had better be read by the Secretary, so that it may be seen whether the amendment is appropriate.

The resolution was read.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The amendment is simply that, after the general invitation to the bishops and clergy of our own Communion, the Anglican Communion, we add then "and any priests or other clergy of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church." That prevents any separate resolution to that end. But the Secretary thinks it would be better to let this drop for a moment and bring it in afterwards.

The PRESIDENT. I think so myself.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution of the Deputy from Western New York.

The resolution was agreed to, and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Shelton, of Western New York; Rev. Dr. Cady, of New York; Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, of Virginia, and Mr. Churchill, of Kentucky, as the committee.

ADMISSIONS TO THE FLOOR.

The Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. Mr. President, there is another complimentary resolution that we are accustomed to pass, which will come very properly in the present stage of the proceedings, if it is admissible:

"Resolved, That clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, of the churches of England and Ireland, and the British Colonial Church, and of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, who may be sojourning in this city, members of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, trustees, professors, and students of the General Theological Seminary; other students of theology who may be candidates for Holy Orders in this Church, former members of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and members of the Vestry of Trinity Church, and also the rector and assistant ministers of the same, be admitted to the sittings of this house."

The resolution was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I move now the following resolution:

"Resolved, That any priests or other clergy of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church be invited to take seats in this Convention."

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. That is a very important matter, and we want to hear something about it.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. It is merely a resolution of courtesy. There is a great body of Christian people, constituting one of the three great bodies of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world, which to-day are not in visible communion, although they are in the unity of the Spirit, and hope for a more clearly defined bond of peace. Hitherto it has only been possible for these various bodies, or at least two of them—that is to say, the Anglican Church and the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church—to meet each other in courtesy. Now,

arrangements have been made through the Archbishop of Canterbury by which the dead of our Communion from England or this country can be buried by the Orthodox clergy, and other offices of courtesy and kindness can be performed. The Archbishop of Syra, representing the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, lately visited the Church of England, and was there received with the greatest honor. Prelates of our own Church and clergy of lower degree have likewise been received by the Eastern clergy. There are, in this city, with the approbation of the Bishop of the Diocese, clergy of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Communion. It is believed, in fact it is known, that they are present now in this House, and, as a member of the Russo-Greek Committee, it was suggested to me that, in the general recognition of the clerical rank and character which these resolutions imply, these brethren should be likewise recognized. It touches not at all the doctrines of their Church; it touches not at all their attitude toward us; it simply recognizes that they are clergy of a Church toward which we hope that, in the providence of God, we may be drawn in love, without any sacrifice of our own principles.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I have no motion to make, but simply rise to suggest to the mover of this resolution whether it would not be well, out of courtesy, to add, "and any bishops or priests or clergy of the Roman Catholic Church!" [Laughter.]

The Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Considering that the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church is holding out her hands to us, and we have asked the clergy of that Communion to bury our dead, promising to bury theirs; and considering that this Church has appointed a committee to correspond with that Church, which committee, composed of Bishops, has fulfilled its duty; considering that for many Conventions past this Church has claimed it as one of her glories that she stands for the unity of Christ's Catholic Church so far as that can be without sacrificing our Protestant and Episcopal position; considering that this Church lies under the anathema of the Church of Rome, I decline to accept the amendment of the Deputy from Kentucky. ["Good." "Good."] The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I ask leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. Forsyth, until Monday next, on account of sickness in his family. Leave was granted.

RULES OF ORDER.

The order of the day was called for.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day is the subject of the rules of order. The Secretary will read the rules proposed for adoption.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. To facilitate business I propose that we take the rules in order and act first on the first one. Let the Secretary read the first rule.

The PRESIDENT. That course will be pursued. The Secretary read the first rule as follows:

"1. The Morning Service of the Church shall be performed every day during the session of the Convention."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the adoption of that rule or order.

The motion was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"2. When the President takes the chair, no member shall continue standing, or shall afterwards stand up, except to address the Chair."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"3. When the President shall have taken the chair, the Roll of Members shall be called, and the Minutes of the preceding day read; but the same may be dispensed with by a majority of the House."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"4. At the opening of the Session, the President shall appoint the following Standing Committees, to wit:

- I. On the State of the Church, to consist of one member from each Diocese; and,
 - II. On the General Theological Seminary.
 - III. On the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.
 - IV. On the Admission of New Dioceses.
 - V. On the Consecration of Bishops.
 - VI. On Canons.
 - VII. On Expenses.
 - VIII. On Unfinished Business.
 - IX. On Elections.
 - X. On the Prayer-Book.
 - XI. On Christian Education; and,
 - XII. On Memorials of Deceased Members.
- Each to consist of thirteen members."

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I move to amend by inserting before the words "On Canons" the words "On the Constitution."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Would it not be better to say "On Amendments to the Constitution"?

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Very well, I will put it in that form.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. No. 3 of the rules of order of the House of Bishops provides for a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution just before their Committee on Canons. I understand Judge Comstock to move that we have a similar committee, and that it be inserted before No. 6 of our Committees, that "On Canons."

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. So that the Sixth Committee will be "On Amendments to the Constitution."

The PRESIDENT. It is proposed that No. 6 of the enumeration of committees be "On Amendments to the Constitution"; of course, changing the subsequent numbers to the end. The question is on that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the adoption of the fourth rule as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. I was going to call attention to another committee—the Committee on the Prayer-Book. I thought we were voting simply on the amendment to introduce the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. If the whole rule has not been adopted, I will ask to say a word or two upon the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

The PRESIDENT. We have adopted the whole rule, but it can be reconsidered at the request of the gentleman with the consent of the House.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. I cannot say that I voted for it, because I thought I voted only for the amendment. But I will not press a motion to reconsider at the present time; I will take another opportunity to do so.

The Secretary read the next proposed rule, as follows:

"5. The Daily Order of Business shall be as follows:

- I. Reading the Minutes.
- II. Communications from the President.
- III. Reports from Standing Committees, in the following order:
 1. On Elections.
 2. On the Admission of New Dioceses.

3. On the Consecration of Bishops.
4. On Canons.
5. On the General Theological Seminary.
6. On the State of the Church.
7. On Expenses.
8. On the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.
9. On the Prayer-Book.
10. On Christian Education.
11. On Unfinished Business.
12. On Memorials of Deceased Members ; and
13. Special Committees in the order of appointment.
- IV. Petitions and Memorials.
- V. Motions and Resolutions.
- VI. Business on the Calendar."

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I move to make this rule correspond with the amendment to the fourth rule by inserting before "On Canons" the words "On Amendments to the Constitution," and to change the numbers to correspond.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that the fifth rule as amended be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"6. The Secretary shall keep a Calendar of Business, on which reports from committees, resolutions which lie over, and other matters undisposed of, shall be placed, in the order in which they are presented."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"7. At 12 o'clock, unless there be an Order of the Day, or as soon thereafter as the Order of the Day shall be disposed of, the business on the Calendar shall be taken up and disposed of, in the order in which it stands thereon; and a vote of two-thirds of the members present shall be required to take up any matter out of its order on the Calendar."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"8. The House shall proceed to the Order of the Day at 12 o'clock precisely, unless dispensed with by a vote of two-thirds of all the members present."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"9. All resolutions shall be reduced to writing, presented to the Secretary, and by him read to the House; and no motion shall be considered before the House unless seconded."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"10. If the question under debate contains several distinct propositions, the same shall be divided, at the request of any member, and a vote taken separately, except that a motion to strike out and insert shall be indivisible."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"11. When a question is under consideration, no motion shall be received, unless to lay it upon the table, to postpone it to a certain time, to postpone it indefinitely, to commit it, or to amend it; and motions for any of these purposes shall have precedence in the order herein named. If a motion to lay on the table an amendment be carried, the matter before the House shall be proceeded with as if no such amendment had been offered. The motions to lay upon the table and to adjourn shall be decided without debate. The motion to adjourn shall always be in order."

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I have a few amendments to offer to this section of rules of order. First. After the words in the second line, "to lay it upon the table," insert the words "previous question"; Secondly. Strike out the whole of the sentence beginning with the words "if a motion to lay

on the table," etc., so that the section as amended will read:

"When a question is under consideration no motion shall be received, unless to lay it upon the table, the previous question, to postpone it to a certain time, to postpone it indefinitely, to commit it, or to amend it; and motions for any of these purposes shall have precedence in the order herein named. Motions to lay upon the table and to adjourn shall be decided without debate. The motion to adjourn shall always be in order."

It will be perceived that I propose a striking out of the second sentence, and the insertion of the words "the previous question" in the first sentence. I am perfectly well aware that in this House heretofore the previous question, which has for its object the stoppage of debate and the bringing of the main question at once to a vote, has been regarded with disfavor; and why? For the simple reason, as I have understood it, that you did not desire to cut off debate; that, after a subject has been discussed until it is threadbare, no portion of this house shall say, "We order now the previous question, having heard sufficient debate upon the subject." Now, is there any consistency between that position and this rule of order as it stands before you? You will find in the rule of order, as it is proposed to adopt it, that not only you cut off debate, but you may cut it off before it has commenced, if you will. The previous question is never ordered until debate is exhausted; but here you propose to cut off debate in its incipency. You provide that "the motions to lay upon the table and to adjourn shall be decided without debate." Therefore the very moment that a Deputy moves an amendment, however important that amendment, and before any discussion shall have been had, another Deputy may move, in his seat, to lay that amendment on the table, and the vote has to be taken without debate.

I say, therefore, there is no consistency between the position that you will never call the previous question (which is a great aid to legislation), and yet will retain a motion to lay upon the table to be decided without debate. You propose, in the sentence that I desire to strike out, not only to lay upon the table any amendment without debate, but that the fate of that amendment shall not interrupt the rest of the question before the House, which is unparliamentary, according to all precedents that I know anything about.

What is the office of a motion to lay on the table? It is when the House is not in a condition, from any cause whatever, to consider the question then pending; they desire to lay it over until a more convenient season, whether it be indefinitely or to a period fixed; not that you will never entertain it. The object of the motion to lay on the table is not to take the subject from before the House, but to postpone the consideration of that subject until a more convenient season. That is the law according to all parliamentary authorities. Now you propose to substitute that motion for another which all parliamentary authors introduce to get rid of a subject; that is, indefinite postponement. When you want to kill a question, to never consider it any more, to take it from before the House, the proper motion is indefinite postponement, not to lay on the table, because to lay it upon the table is to pass it over temporarily to be called up again; but an indefinite postponement reaches to the extent of killing the proposition, of taking it from before the House as if it never had been before the House.

In order to sustain these positions allow me to refer to a standard authority, Mr. Cushing's Manual, which, I believe, is now in use in all deliberative bodies. Mr. Cushing says, in Section 67:

"In order to suppress a question altogether, without coming to a direct vote upon it, in such a man-

ner that it cannot be renewed, the proper motion is for indefinite postponement ;"—

Not to lay upon the table.
—"that is, a postponement or adjournment of the question, without fixing any day for resuming it. The effect of this motion, if decided in the affirmative, is to quash the proposition entirely ; as an indefinite adjournment is equivalent to a dissolution, or the continuance of a suit without day is a discontinuance of it. A negative decision has no effect whatever."

Thus you perceive that Mr. Cushing says the proper mode of taking a subject from before the House is by an indefinite postponement. Now let us see what he says on the subject of laying on the table, Sections 68, 69, and 71 :

"If the Assembly is willing to entertain and consider a question, but not at the time when it is moved, the proper course is either to postpone the subject to another day, or to order it to lie on the table."

"When the members individually want more information than they possess at the time a question is moved, or desire further time for reflection and examination, the proper motion is to postpone the subject to such other day as will answer the views of the Assembly."

"If the Assembly has something else before it which claims its present attention, and is, therefore, desirous to postpone a particular proposition until that subject is disposed of, such postponement may be effected by means of a motion that the matter in question lie on the table. If this motion prevails, the subject so disposed of may be taken up at any time afterwards and considered when it may suit the convenience of the Assembly."

So, you perceive, that laying on the table is simply disposing of a matter temporarily, and it is liable to be called up at any future time when the Assembly desires to do so. He says in Section 171 :

"This motion is usually resorted to when the Assembly has something else before it which claims its present attention, and, therefore, desires to lay aside a proposition for a short but indefinite time, reserving to itself the power to take it up when convenient. This motion takes precedence of and supercedes all the other subsidiary motions."

By "subsidiary motions," he means motions which have for their object to dispose of the main question, whether temporarily or permanently. It seems to me, then, Mr. President, that there is no valid objection to the first amendment proposed by me inserting the previous question. It simply gives to the House the right, when in its discretion it will exercise it, to bring a vote upon the main question, which main question will be the then pending amendment not already adopted. There can be no objection to this in principle, inasmuch as you propose now and have in the past rules of this House conferred the right to dispose of any amendment by a motion to lay it on the table without debate.

The second amendment which I propose is to strike out the provision that, where a motion to lay upon the table an amendment is carried, the House will proceed with the subject-matter under discussion the same as if that motion had not prevailed, taking with it the amendment. That is a bad rule for legislation. There is no object in that sort of procedure. If you desire to reject an amendment vote "nay," do not move to lay it on the table. It is disrespectful to start with, and it is bad legislation in any point of view. The object of laying on the table, you perceive, is simply to postpone the consideration of a matter to a future period, and, therefore, it is done without debate. But when you propose to lay on the table as a means of killing a matter, and to say that that shall be done without debate, it is not correct.

You take the idea, which is a correct idea, of deciding the motion to lay on the table without debate, because it is simply postponing the consideration of the question ; but you incorporate it here so as to cut off debate upon that proposition now and for ever. That is not parliamentary ; but that is what you propose to do. You have heretofore refused to allow the previous question upon the ground that you will not cut off debate, and yet you take the subject-matter from before the House without debate upon a motion to lay on the table. You have got to strike out that clause, I think, whatever standpoint you take. If you reject the insertion of the previous question, on the ground that you are not willing to cut off debate, you certainly must sustain my second amendment to strike out the sentence which cuts off debate, by a motion to lay on the table new matter which never has been discussed.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburg. Mr. President, I presume that this question will be divided before we take a vote upon it. The gentleman presents two separate and independent propositions. One is that we adopt as a rule of order the previous question. That is a matter for very grave consideration, and I hope that this House will pause and deliberate before we agree to put upon our rules of order that rule which has been so often designated as the "gag-law." The whole sum and substance of the previous question is that a majority of the House can at any moment by a vote stop all debate, and prevent that discussion which I think in free governments and in a free church ought always to prevail. We have been practising under what may be considered the rule of the Senate of the United States. The Senate and the House of Representatives differ with regard to the previous question. The House of Representatives have the previous question as one of their rules, and any of us who have read the debates of Congress have seen how often the exercise of that rule has been complained of by the minority. Anything can be forced through the House without a moment of notice, without its being known that the debate is about to be stopped, when many members wish to be heard and when many members ought to be heard. The Senate has never adopted such a rule, but the way that they have practised in regard to this question, as I understand it, is to appoint a time when a vote shall be taken. Then all have notice that the vote will be taken at such a time, and can act accordingly. That has been the practice of this House heretofore. We all recollect, who were members of the last General Convention, how frequently that rule was put into force. After discussion had been carried on for a certain length of time, when it was the feeling of the House that the matter had been worn threadbare, or that at all events it was time to take a vote, we did not adopt this peremptory rule of closing the debate *instantly*, but we fixed a time, say "to-morrow at 10 o'clock" or "this afternoon at 4 o'clock," when debate should close upon the question and the vote be taken. It strikes me that that is more in accordance with that principle of the Constitution of this Convention which prescribes that there shall be freedom of debate. How can there be freedom of debate if a majority of this House can, at any moment and without any warning, close debate, and shut the mouth of every member of the House who wishes to discuss the question?

I ask, sir, that this question be divided : that we first take the vote on the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana, proposing that the previous question be inserted as one of the rules of the House. I think it is a right which we have under parliamentary law, to call for a division of a question containing distinct propositions.

The PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. With regard to the second proposition, I may have something to say upon that when it comes before us.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Mr. President, I have an amendment which bears on both the questions, and which should be considered in connection with both, and with the permission of the House I will read it. It is to be added to the twelfth rule:

"In order to secure due freedom of debate with proper despatch of business of the House, any member may move to reject, amend, or otherwise modify any resolution or measure reported for adoption by any committee of the House. In debating such a motion the members shall not speak more than ten minutes each, unless leave be granted by the House."

I have been in this body many years, and I have never yet seen the time when, if a gentleman had spoken ten minutes, he could not secure an extension of his time if he had been talking sense. Two objects are to be kept in view. We are to secure and preserve freedom of debate, and, at the same time, we are to act so as to facilitate the despatch of business. I think the proposition which I submit reasonably secures both purposes, and is a fair compromise.

Several DEPUTIES. Is that proposition in order?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The motion is that, instead of inserting the previous question in this rule, we put the provision just read in the next rule when we come to it, which is a fair proposition; because, instead of the previous question, it gives us a substitute.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. That is it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. But I rise to suggest that I do not believe all the Convention are aware of the fact that the right of a minority to protest and debate a question introduced here by a majority is secured, and that the power of a majority to move a measure, and pass it without a word being said, is absolutely prohibited by the first article of our Constitution. It stands in the fore-front of the organic law under which we live. I will read the brief words:

"In all business of the Convention, freedom of debate shall be allowed."

Now, Mr. President, if you insert here these two little words "previous question," the controlling majority of this House can preconcert a measure; a man may rise on the floor here and move that measure; a gentleman by his side may second it; the same party may move the previous question; the party by his side may second it. There is nothing for the Convention to do. The mover may even make a long speech in favor of his measure (which is one of the unjust ways of carrying out the previous question), and at the close of his speech move the previous question, and not a man in the House has a right to say a word if a majority of the House adopt the previous question; and, no matter what the objection may be, if there be a numerical majority to carry it, it will be carried through the House, without the privilege of a word being said by any one opposed to it. Is that living up to the Constitution which guarantees to us freedom of debate? This is a matter, Mr. President, which the minority, upon all questions, are mainly interested in. Hence it is guarded by the Constitution, and therefore it is that I appeal to this House, and to the majority of this House, that they do not impose any such unjust rule upon any minority on any question. I have seen a motion made in a deliberative body, a long speech made in favor of the proposition, and at the close of that long speech in favor of it, a motion to adopt the previous question,

the previous question seconded, no one allowed even to correct statements of fact which were misstatements, no one allowed to make an argument against it, and a vote forced upon that body adopting the proposition, without allowing a syllable to be said on either side. Now, the gentleman from Louisiana says that the same thing is allowed by the motion to lay a proposition on the table. On the contrary, you can never compel a body to accept or reject any proposition without debate by moving to lay it upon the table. They have neither adopted it nor rejected it when they have laid it upon the table. Under this rule it may be so with an amendment; but when a motion is laid on the table it is simply a declaration that the body does not wish to discuss that question at that time; it does not wish to vote either "yea" or "nay." It does not wish to adopt it or reject it, but lets it drop for the present to take up something else.

I repeat, that the insertion of the words "previous question" is a distinct violation of the rule of our Constitution, obligatory upon us all, that freedom of debate shall be allowed. Of course we are permitted to make our rules of order—we may limit debate, we may limit the time of remarks, we may fix the time when we shall take a vote—for all questions in a convention are always subject to the vote of the convention, and under their control.

The PRESIDENT. I considered the proposition offered by Mr. Ruggles to be, in the way he presented it, as simply argumentative. If it is an additional rule, his reading of it was to show cause why you should not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana; but it cannot be in order unless it be moved as a part of the eleventh rule.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Well, I make it a part of the eleventh rule.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Ruggles says now that he offers it as part of the eleventh rule. Therefore it is in order as the first amendment to that rule to be voted on.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I think, with due submission to the Chair, that where there are two amendments, separate and independent in themselves, we must take the vote separately on the first amendment that is offered. You take, of course, the vote on an amendment to an amendment before you vote on the amendment itself; but when there are two separate and distinct amendments to a matter before the House, you take a vote on the first amendment, adopt that or reject it, and then take a vote on the second, because they are independent of each other. We may or may not vote down the motion for the previous question. If we vote it down, then the motion of the gentleman from New York will be perfectly in order. But we ought to have the opportunity of voting upon the previous question first, as a separate and independent amendment to the rule of order which is now before the House.

The PRESIDENT. I consider that it cannot otherwise be in order. That motion of the gentleman from New York was an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I did not so understand. I understood it more as a reason why we should vote down the previous question, because, if we do vote it down, the gentleman from New York then intends to introduce another amendment which will answer the purpose.

The PRESIDENT. That is logically so; but in this science of rules of order, as I understand, nothing can be offered when one amendment is presented, except new matter, as an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If

I apprehend the case aright, the proposition of Mr. Ruggles takes the place of the motion to insert the previous question. Put into technical legal form, according to parliamentary rules, his motion is this: "That the words 'previous question' be stricken out, and that there be substituted therefor" the words named by him at the end of the section.

The PRESIDENT. He could not have made that motion, because the words "previous question" have not been put in.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It is an amendment to an amendment, I understand. When an amendment is offered to an amendment, it may be offered in several ways. It may be first adding to the amendment, or it may be striking out the amendment and substituting other matter for it, either of which propositions is proper. Gentlemen are in the habit of very loosely saying, "I move this as an amendment to that." How? Will you add this to that, or put this in place of that? The motion of Mr. Ruggles here is to amend the motion to insert the previous question by inserting instead of it the words of his proposition. If I am wrong, the gentleman who made the motion will correct me. When we have adopted this amendment to the amendment, if we do so, the previous question is wiped out. We come to the question, then, whether we will incorporate the amendment to the amendment into the original proposition. That, I think, is familiar parliamentary law.

The PRESIDENT. The first question is on the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Ruggles).

The Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Something more must be done if you adopt that course, for if you read the rule with that insertion the gentleman will see that it is impossible to adopt it in that form. It will be, "When a question is under consideration, no motion shall be received, unless to lay it upon the table; and in order to secure freedom of debate with proper despatch of the business of the House, any member may move to reject, amend, or otherwise modify any resolution or measure reported for adoption by any committee of the House." You cannot insert it in that form, I think.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. It is proposed to go in at the end of the rule.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, I understand that the eleventh rule is before the House. The text of the eleventh rule is the matter before the House. The gentleman from Louisiana moves to insert in that text, after the first clause as to the order of motions, the words "the previous question." That is an amendment to the text proposed. The only amendment to that amendment that can be admitted is to substitute something else for it that would be congruous to the text, or to leave out some words in it, or to reject them. I say, therefore, with due respect to the Chair, that the Chair ought to rule out for the present what is proposed as an amendment to the amendment, simply because it is a departure from the rule of an amendment to an amendment, inasmuch as it does not propose to modify the amendment in any way, but proposes simply to insert an entirely different proposition. The eleventh rule provides for the order of motions.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I withdraw my proposition for the present.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Ruggles having withdrawn his proposition, the question is on the first amendment of Mr. Race.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move an indefinite postponement of the amendment to insert the previous question.

The PRESIDENT. Under our present rules, I think that postponement would carry the whole subject.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Then I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to insert "the previous question" after the word "table" in the second line of the eleventh rule.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the second amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana to strike out the following words: "If a motion to lay on the table an amendment be carried, the matter before the House shall be proceeded with as if no such amendment had been offered."

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the adoption of the eleventh rule as reported.

The rule was adopted.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Now, I offer as an additional rule, to come in after Rule 11th, the proposition which I submitted before:

"In order to secure due freedom of debate, with proper despatch of the business of the House, any member may move to reject, amend, or otherwise modify any resolution or measure reported for adoption by any committee of the House. In debating such motion, the members shall not speak more than ten minutes each, unless leave be granted by the House."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I raise the point of order whether that motion is now in order. We have already decided to take these rules seriatim. We must go through with them as they are printed and presented to us. Then, when we are through, it will be in order for any member to introduce an additional rule. But if we begin to introduce additional rules now, we shall throw the whole thing into disorder. I hope we shall go straight through just as we resolved to do.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. It occurs to me that any proposition which is germane to the question before us, that is, to the rules of order, may come in before we proceed with the succeeding rules, because we are now adopting a new set of rules; and this matter is germane to the question we now have under consideration. Therefore we are not to wait until we go through the whole, and then take it up.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. Is the proposition to limit gentlemen to ten minutes on any subject that may come up?

The PRESIDENT. I am not able to answer.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. If it is, I have simply to say that it would be an excellent thing, no doubt, to teach every member of this Convention to confine himself to ten minutes; but the General Convention is not a good school for that kind of training, and all experience has shown that the effect of making such a rule would be to limit the freedom of debate.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered as an additional rule by the Deputy from New York (Mr. Ruggles).

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. There is nothing in this proposition but the ten-minutes' rule. All the rest we have now under the rules of the House. It is a mere question now, therefore, whether we will adopt the ten-minute rule. I suppose the Convention is not prepared to do it.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next proposed rule, as follows:

"12. There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee, or upon a motion to recommit any subject which has been before a committee. And if objection be made to the consideration of a resolution designed for the action of the House, without a reference to a committee, it shall lie over, and come up the next

day as unfinished business. But the member who offers such resolution or motion may speak five minutes, for the purpose of explaining its object."

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I rise for information. The eleventh rule provides that a motion to commit shall be one of the motions debatable. Now, here, it is true, the word "resolution" is used; but is it perfectly clear what the difference is? A resolution to be committed is not debatable, while a motion to commit is debatable. I rise to ask what the difference is, and whether it is sufficiently clear that there is any difference?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The object of the rule was to prevent two debates on the same subject in the House. A member rises and submits a resolution, which, under the rules of the House, ought to go to a committee. He is allowed by this proposed rule five minutes to explain the object of his resolution. Thereupon, as a standing order of the House, the resolution goes to a committee without further debate. When the committee has acted upon it, it comes back, and then the gentleman from Maryland can speak at large. So upon a question which has been once before a committee and comes back for the consideration of the House, and for some technical want of form, or for some reason or other, the House desires to send it back to the committee, the motion to commit is to be submitted under this rule without debate. The result is that when a measure is perfected the subject will be open for legitimate debate, and for the final action of the House.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I see what was in the mind of the committee, and yet it is not at all clear to my mind, and I will state my difficulty once more. I will read the twelfth rule as it is printed:

"There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee."

Not a matter that comes from a committee. If I make a motion, if I offer a resolution to this House and say that that resolution is to be committed to a committee, I cannot debate it, nor can I upon a motion to recommit it. Again:

"And if objection be made to the consideration of a resolution"

That is a separate subject altogether—

—"designed for the action of the House without a reference to a committee, it shall lie over and come up the next day as unfinished business. But the member who offers such resolution"

What resolution? A resolution that he wants passed without sending it to a committee. —"such resolution or motion may speak five minutes."

Here are two separate things. When a member offers a resolution, and couples that resolution with a proposition to send it to a committee, he cannot debate it; but if he offers a resolution and does not say it is to be sent to a committee, then he may explain his views for five minutes.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, really taking the context, I think there is no ground for the objection of my friend from Maryland; but, to obviate all possibility of criticism, I move to transpose the sentence, "But the member who offers such resolution or motion may speak five minutes, for the purpose of explaining its object," to that part of the rule after the word "committee" in the third line, so that the rule will read:

"There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee, or upon a motion to recommit any subject which has been before a committee. But the member who offers such resolution or motion may speak five minutes for the purpose of explaining its object."

The other clause of the Rule has respect to business that ought properly upon objection to go on the Calendar, and therefore a speech of five minutes on

that is not necessary. I move therefore to transpose the last clause so as to make it the second, and the second clause the third.

RECESS.

The PRESIDENT. I ask the gentleman to give way that we may receive an interesting communication from the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. I will announce to the Convention that lunch is prepared for the members of the Convention, and is now ready, and that a motion for a brief recess for the purpose of giving attention to it I think, with all due deference, will be in order.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I make the motion that half an hour's recess be taken.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly took a recess for half an hour. At the expiration of that time the President resumed the chair.

PRINTING OF MEMORIALS.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I wish to present a memorial, and move that it be referred and printed to save the time of the house, and I take this course after consultation with various members of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Texas moves to suspend the business which was being discussed before the recess to receive a paper, and the Chair will suggest that there are business matters of importance to be acted on promptly, and which can be attended to during the suspension.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I move that the memorial from the diocese of Texas, touching the setting off of a portion of its territory into missionary jurisdictions, which I now present, be referred to the Committee on Canons, and ordered to be printed, and a sufficient number of copies being printed to be distributed to the House.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Perhaps the memorial of California, which was suspended when the order of the day was called for, had better be included in that motion.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I will include the memorial of California in my motion. I move that the memorials of California and Texas be referred to the Committee on Canons, and ordered to be printed in sufficient number to distribute copies to the House.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I think it would be an unnecessary expense to print all the formal matter of these memorials. The principal part is very short. If we begin printing memorials at their entire length, we shall add to the expenses of the General Convention. I move that only such portions as are necessary to an understanding of the purport of the papers be printed.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I will explain, so far as the memorial of our diocese is concerned, that it has no formality about it, save a dozen lines. The rest consists of the facts stated for the judgment of this Convention. It is not a long memorial.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Deputy from Texas.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. This is establishing a precedent which may give us trouble before we get through the sessions of this body. I think there is a growing feeling of antagonism to this great use of paper and type. The expense of it is never estimated at the moment, but in the aggregate it amounts to a very great deal, and I think this body should be careful as to the expenditure of money where it can be avoided.

It seems to me that these memorials have only one office, and that is to have their contents submitted to the deliberation of this body, while the

subject of which they are the predicate is being discussed. If these memorials are referred to the proper committees, and the subject is proposed for action by these committees, if the gentlemen who bring the memorials here read them to us as part of their speeches, the whole House gets the full possession of their contents at the time. If these memorials are printed, they will be taken home and probably will not be on hand at the time the debate comes up; in most instances the reading of them will be deferred until the time when the debate does come up, and we shall find that the mind of the House will be probably less fully informed on the subject than if at the time the discussion takes place the gentlemen from Texas and California would rise, and, as part of the discussion, here read the memorials to the House. We know what the subject-matter will be. We know that it is as to the division of dioceses.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Not the division.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Well, we shall be able to comprehend the matter of the memorials as they are read. It is not proposed to take any action at this particular time. One of them is in print already; it was read this morning from a printed copy, as I observed. It seems to me that, instead of setting the precedent of printing these long memorials, and incurring a heavy expenditure thereby, it would be far better when the time comes for those who represent the memorialists to read the memorials, and then they would be open for discussion.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Cornwall) suggested that only the important parts of the memorials be printed. I did not observe that he made any motion.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President, when the memorial of California was being read this morning, objection was taken thereto upon the double ground, first, that it took the time of this House, and next, that it could not be heard, and the objector suggested that these important memorials—memorials that have been before the General Convention substantially for nine years—should be printed, that the prayer of these dioceses might be understood, and that it might be acted upon with some degree of understanding, and candor, and caution. Then I objected. I desired that the memorial of Texas should be heard upon this floor from my lips or the lips of the Secretary; but on consultation with the different members of the Committee on Canons and various members of this Convention, I have come to the conclusion that Texas will be content if her memorial can be printed and put into the hands of the members of the Convention, and then, if she can, be heard at the proper time without an attempt even to read it. In order to facilitate business, I asked a suspension of the order of the day that this might be done, and now I ask that my motion to print and send to the Committee on Canons may not be negatived, but that it may be granted, and, by-and-by, when it comes before you, I will take a few moments to explain it.

Rev. Mr. EASTON, of California. I believe a sufficient number of the California memorials are printed already for the information of the House.

The PRESIDENT. Then I suppose the gentleman from Texas withdraws his motion as to the California memorial.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Yes. My motion is only to print the memorial from Texas, and to refer both memorials to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

RECEPTION OF CANADIAN CLERGY.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. In be-

half of the Committee appointed at the last annual Convention—

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. The regular business was only suspended for one specific subject, and other business is not in order.

The PRESIDENT. No; it was suspended for several purposes. I distinctly announced myself that I had several things to bring before the House, matters of detail, but which it is very important to dispose of. If the gentleman from New Jersey will pardon me, I will bring these matters to the notice of the House now.

There has been put in my hands a paper adopted at a meeting of the Provincial Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada. There is a delegation here expecting to present this paper to the House. The Metropolitan of Canada also is here desiring to present an address to the two Houses of the General Convention, and he wants a time fixed when this can be done. I ask the House now to fix a time and to appoint a committee to wait upon these gentlemen and inform them of the time.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that to-morrow, at 12 o'clock, it be the special order of the day to receive these gentlemen and hear the address of the Metropolitan of Canada, and also to have the address of the Synod read, and also that a committee be appointed to wait upon them.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Did I understand the Chair to say that these gentlemen from Canada had a memorial from the Church in Canada in relation to bringing our body and theirs more closely together?

The PRESIDENT. I did not state the purpose of the paper; only that there was a paper.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Then I move the appointment of the committee which was desired by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT. The appointment of a committee to carry out the purpose indicated by the motion of Dr. Mead is also moved. The Chair will put the question on the motion as thus amended.

The motion was agreed to; and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Rudder, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Fish, of New York; and Mr. Ruggles, of New York, as the committee.

NEW DIOCESE IN NEW JERSEY.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. In behalf of the Committee appointed at the last Annual Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey, I present the papers touching the proposed division of the Diocese of New Jersey, and I move that these papers be referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses.

The motion was agreed to.

HYMNAL MEMORIAL.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. May I be allowed, Mr. President, a word of explanation? The delegation from Pennsylvania have a memorial from that Diocese to the General Convention. They are not prepared, as it is not now in order, to present that memorial, and they have not as yet received any certified copy of the memorial. My object is only to make an explanation that certain documents connected with this memorial were put into the hands of the Secretary of this House, and they have been distributed throughout the House. I wish to call attention to this fact, or otherwise the documents may be passed over. They are relative to reports of the Committee on the Revision of the Hymn-Book. I find that the Secretary of the House has caused copies to be placed in every pew. At the proper time, when it is in order, I shall take the liberty of

presenting the memorial from the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

HOURS OF SITTING.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, has any time been fixed for the sessions of the House?

The PRESIDENT. Not yet.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the sessions be from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 in the afternoon, allowing half an hour for recess.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I move to amend that the recess be from half-past 1 to 2 o'clock.

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I offer the following resolution, and I move that it be referred to the Committee on Canons for consideration and report:

"Resolved, That the following be added to the standing orders:

"That the Secretary of the House of Deputies and the Treasurer of the Convention, when not returned as Deputies to the Convention, shall be members of this House, with the right to speak as to the subjects of their respective offices, but without the right to vote."

The Secretary now is not a member of the House, but frequently he is necessitated to make explanations. The Treasurer of the Convention is not a member, but he should be here, and it is necessary for him sometimes to make explanations as to matters connected with his office. That he should be allowed to do, and I make the motion that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Canons to consider and report whether it is advisable.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion to refer was agreed to.

ENGLISH CHURCH CONGRESS.

The following message (No. 3) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has appointed the Bishops of Indiana, Minnesota, and Central New York as the Joint Committee on the part of this House to reply to the communication received yesterday from the President of the Church Congress, sitting at Brighton, England."

The SECRETARY. I can state to the House that the following message will be sent this afternoon:

NEW YORK, October 8, 1874.

"The General Convention reciprocates the greeting of the Church Congress, and prays for the unity of the whole Church in the faith of our Lord Jesus."

BISHOP OF INDIANA,

Chairman Joint Committee.

RULES OF ORDER.

Several Deputies called for the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day is called for. The twelfth proposed rule was under consideration at the recess, and Mr. Sheffey, of Virginia, had moved an amendment to transpose the last sentence of the twelfth rule in these words, "But the member who offers such resolution or motion may speak five minutes, for the purpose of explaining its object," and insert it after the word "committee" in the third line of the text.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I move to amend that rule further by adding after the word

"over" in the fifth line the following words: "unless two-thirds shall vote to proceed to its immediate consideration." The rule is now that, "if objection be made to the consideration of a resolution designed for the action of the House, without a reference to a committee, it shall lie over, and come up the next day as unfinished business."

A resolution might be offered which might require immediate action. Some provision ought to be made by a vote of two-thirds to proceed to its immediate consideration; and I therefore move to add after the word "over" in the fifth line the words "unless two-thirds shall vote to proceed to its immediate consideration." When a proposition is offered to the Convention, any member, as the rule now stands, can object to it and defeat it; but by adding the words I propose, two-thirds can vote to consider it immediately. In the latter days of this Convention very important questions may come up requiring immediate action, and therefore the House ought to have the power by a two-thirds vote, at any time, to dispense with this rule.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Kentucky hear me for a moment?

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Let me suggest the insertion, after the words "unfinished business," in the sixth line, of these words: "But by a vote of two-thirds of the members present the House may at once consider the resolution."

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I accept that. I only want to put the matter in the power of the Convention.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I think the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky might be met by another rule, but this amendment will answer the purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The twelfth rule as amended was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"13. All amendments shall be considered in the order in which they are moved. When a proposed amendment is under consideration, a motion to amend the same may be made. No after amendment to such second amendment shall be in order. No proposition on a subject different from the one under consideration shall be received under color of a substitute."

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. It seems to me that the first line of this thirteenth rule expresses that it is not true in point of fact that "all amendments shall be considered in the order in which they are moved." I supposed that the universal action of all deliberative bodies was in the reverse order. You do not first act on an amendment, and if that is lost, then consider an amendment to that amendment; but you first put the question on the amendment to the amendment, and if that is lost, then put it on the amendment. Now, this rule provides for the other mode of doing business—that you shall first put the amendment, and then if that is lost, the amendment to the amendment. I apprehend that we do not wish to do business in that order; hence I move to amend by inserting the word "reverse" after the word "the" in the first line, so as to read, "all amendments shall be considered in the reverse order in which they are moved."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not read that rule as the gentleman does. It strikes me that the object of the rule is simply to provide that, when four or five or two or three single and separate amendments are moved to a measure before the House, they shall be taken up in the order in which they are moved. It does not apply to the case of an amendment to an amendment. We all know, when that is moved, the vote on the amendment to the amendment must be taken first. That is a matter of course. This rule simply provides that, where

there are three or four independent amendments moved to a measure before the House, the vote shall be taken upon those amendments chronologically; that is, in the order in which they are moved. When there is an amendment to an amendment, of course the vote will be taken on the amendment to the amendment first, and then upon the amendment, whether amended or otherwise. I think there can be no difficulty in the practical carrying out of the rule just exactly as it is printed.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. This rule of order provides that there shall be but two amendments at one time. Where, therefore, do the third and fourth amendments come in? I should like the Deputy from Pittsburgh to give us an example.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. We had one this morning, made by the gentleman himself, if I recollect aright, when he proposed two amendments to the eleventh rule. One was to insert the previous question, and the other was to strike out a portion of the rule which was printed. There were two independent amendments. If they had been moved by separate persons, of course one would have had to be moved first and the other second. I take it this rule simply means that, in a case of that kind, the vote shall be taken on the first amendment, and then be taken upon the second amendment. There can be, of course, only one amendment to an amendment. That we understand, and it is provided for by this rule. Where there is an amendment to an amendment, the vote is taken upon the second amendment first, and then upon the original amendment. There cannot be a third amendment to an amendment, but there may be as many amendments to the matter before the House as members choose to present for the consideration of the House; and it is to prevent the confusion which may arise when there have been several amendments moved, that it is provided that the vote on them shall be taken in their order as they have been moved.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I would enquire whether it is at all necessary to have that first clause: "All amendments shall be considered in the order in which they are moved"? Would it not be a matter of course under what may be called the common parliamentary law? Would it not be the natural course of proceeding if there were no such provision?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I suggest whether, when a gentleman states that he has two amendments, it is not a mere matter of courtesy to allow them to be announced. He cannot offer one until the other is acted upon. I do not understand that we can take up a half-dozen amendments, although a member can notify us of them; but we can vote on one after another. There can be but one proposition before us at a time, and an amendment must be an amendment to that. My friend from Louisiana (Mr. Race) presented two amendments to one rule. He did not offer both so that we had them both before us at the same time; but we voted on one and then the other came up. You cannot offer two amendments to be before the House at once, as I understand, and then have an amendment made to the first amendment and an amendment made to the second amendment. There is but one amendment that can be offered at a time. By strict rule any amendment then that comes before us is an amendment to that, and therefore the language here, I think, should be, "in the reverse order." By courtesy, we had two amendments before us, but it was not by strict rule. We act on one, and then on the other. Now, if I offer an amendment, and a gentleman from another diocese offers another amendment, are the two to remain before us, *pari passu*, until we choose to decide for one or the other or both? Not at all. Until one amendment is de-

cided, nothing is proper but an amendment to that. Therefore this should be "in the reverse order."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, It is not out of order to move successive amendments to a pending proposition. It is the order of parliamentary bodies to consider them in the order in which they are moved; and this rule is as old as Parliament itself. A member may rise and move an amendment. Another member may rise and move another amendment. It is the duty of the speaker to entertain the first amendment, laying the second aside, and when the House is ready to consider that amendment, to proceed to its consideration. Before the House of Representatives of the United States there are oftentimes a dozen amendments pending, or rather submitted for successive consideration.

There is another form of amendment where a blank is to be put in. For instance, a resolution is offered: "Resolved, That the next session of this General Convention shall be held in the city of ——" to fill that blank is in the nature of an amendment to the text. The first place named will be first voted on, and the second place named next, and the third and fourth in the order in which they were proposed. It has been the rule of this House since it was organized, I am informed, certainly it is an old rule of the House, merely to guide the speaker or the President in the order in which he shall put questions to the House. It has no respect whatever to amendments to amendments. That class of amendments is provided for in the text of the rule itself. I think the introduction of the word "reverse" here would invert the order of parliamentary proceedings, for, as I say, the established rule of Parliament is, for instance in filling a blank, to take the vote on the first thing named, and so on until you run through them all.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Deputy from Louisiana (Mr. Race) to insert the word "reverse."

The amendment was rejected.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I move to amend the pending rule of order by inserting, after the third sentence ending "shall be in order," the words:

"When an amendment to an amendment is under consideration, a substitute for the whole matter may be received."

I called attention yesterday to the change which had been made in these proposed rules by the omission of the words which I have just read; and it was then answered that parliamentary usage recognized the right of a member to propose a substitute for the whole matter. That was given as the reason for its omission. But it seems to me that this is not a reason which should weigh with us so as to prevent these words being restored. I wish simply to have the words restored, and have the rule of order read as it read three years ago. The House of Bishops have this as a part of their rules of order, and as far as parliamentary usage is concerned, it seems to me that the doctors are by no means agreed as to what is parliamentary usage; and this rule might be interpreted, I think, as indicating that no such substitute should be received on the ground that this body had formally expunged these words. I am in favor of restoring the words on the ground that they were a part of the rules of order three years ago, and on that account, if on no other, it is desirable to have them put in again.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. That clause which is now proposed to be reinserted was in the old rule, "That when an amendment to an amendment is under consideration, a substitute for the whole matter may be received." The rule just in advance of that declares "no amendment after a second amendment shall be entertained," and that provision of the old

rule was knocked in the head by allowing an amendment to an amendment to be made by way of substitute for the whole matter. Now, sir, I say that every evil which the experience and wisdom of hundreds of years have discovered in going beyond the second degree by way of amendment is to be found in this very proposition. What is it? A proposition is introduced; an amendment to that proposition is brought before the House; an amendment to the amendment is brought before the House; and then, when the House is in a condition to vote intelligently upon the entire subject, there is introduced, slap-dash, a grand overslaughing proposition to take the entire subject from before the consideration of the House.

It may be that there is benefit by mere brute force, under the power of an overwhelming majority, in carrying a proposition over the heads of all principles and rules in the manner allowed by the former practice of the House; but on this floor I have seen the deliberate views and intentions of members of the House overwhelmed and crushed by the introduction of what is called a substitute, depriving members of an opportunity of voting upon the propositions as they were debated, as they were understood, in succession, until they reached the grand main proposition.

Now, what is gained by such a departure from all parliamentary law as this? What does the experience of parliamentarians say? for, talk as you choose, a substitute is an amendment in the third degree. Cushing says:

"Every amendment which can be proposed, whether by striking out or inserting, or striking out and inserting, is itself susceptible of amendment; but there can be no amendment of an amendment to an amendment; this would be such a piling of questions one upon another, as would lead to great embarrassment; and as the line must be drawn somewhere, it has been fixed by usage after the amendment to the amendment. The object, which is proposed to be effected by such a proceeding, must be sought by rejecting the amendment to the amendment, in the form in which it is proposed, and then moving it again in the form in which it is wished to be amended, in which it is only an amendment to an amendment; and in order to accomplish this, he who desires to amend an amendment should give notice that, if rejected in the form in which it is presented, he shall move it again in the form in which he desires to have it adopted."

There seems to be in the minds of members on the floor some magical idea connected with this word "substitute." Why, sir, there is no such thing as a substitute in parliamentary phrase; it is only an amendment by way of striking out and inserting, and nothing else. If you have an original proposition, you can strike out all after the enacting clause and insert something else. That is a substitute. Or, if it be as an amendment to an amendment, you move to strike out all after the first word in the amendment and insert something else. That is an amendment to an amendment; it is not a substitute in the sense of being at all different from an amendment to an amendment. All parliamentary motions to improve a proposition are by way of amendment; it may be by substituting one text for another, but it is still an amendment. I say, therefore, that there is no parliamentary propriety or logic in this provision of the old rule which, as all parliamentarians say, tends to pile question upon question and to breed confusion in the mind of the House, instead of deliberation and proper decision. I think that the amended rule ought to be adopted. I move to amend it by striking out the last word "substitute" and inserting "amendment."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I should like to

ask the gentleman from Virginia if the language of the last sentence ought not to be corrected so as to read:

"No proposition on a subject different from the one under consideration shall be received under color of a substitute, but a proposition on the same subject may be received."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move to strike out "substitute" and insert "amendment," and I will state the reason why that clause is there. A proposition may be so totally changed by amendment as to have no shred of the original idea in it. Various examples are given in the books on the subject where the entire purpose and object of an original proposition has been changed by that parliamentary device an amendment. I understand, however, that it has been the rule of this House—and I consider it a proper rule—that amendments shall be germane to the subject under consideration; and this last clause was designed only to convey the idea that no proposition on a subject different from the one under consideration shall be received by way of "substitute," as the word is here, but it should be "by way of amendment." This is in conformity with the rules of parliamentary proceeding in a large majority of the legislative bodies of the United States. It is not the rule of the House of Commons. If the House choose to fall back upon the principle of the House of Commons, and allow adroit parliamentary manoeuvres to withdraw from the attention and consideration of the House the main idea of the original proposition by way of amendment, they will leave out that clause; but if the House intend to adhere to the rule that no amendment which is not pertinent or germane to the original proposition shall be entertained, then they will retain this clause in the rule.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Do I understand that the gentleman from Virginia proposes to change the text of the rule?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Yes. I move to strike out the word "substitute" and insert "amendment."

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. It was to that particular point that I was about addressing myself, because the rule which has already been passed, stating what motions may be made when a subject is under consideration, does not mention a substitute as one of those motions. Therefore a motion by way of substitute cannot be entertained at all; and in order to make the rules consistent with themselves, a change should be made in that word.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia, striking out the word "substitute," and putting in its place "amendment" in the last line of the rule.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the adoption of the rule as amended.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Are we to understand that, if this rule be passed, hereafter a substitute cannot be offered after there has been an amendment to an amendment? I recollect that yesterday, when this matter came up, and the question was asked why these words were left out, the answer made—and I believe it received the assent generally of those persons who had thought about it—was, that they were not necessary, because, by all parliamentary rule, a substitute could be offered after an amendment had been made to an amendment. And, if I recollect aright, the gentleman from Virginia, at the last sitting of the General Convention, when called upon in his place, explained and gave the reasons why it was that, where there was an amendment offered to an amendment, another resolution offering a substitute for the whole could be

received, and could be acted upon as a part of the parliamentary law.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I never said "as a part of the parliamentary law," but "as a part of our then existing rules." I certainly never heard of such a proposition in any parliamentary or deliberative body except this.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I recollect differently; but, of course, the gentleman recollects better than I do what he said. But, Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to have just such a rule as was provided for by the last House. In my own experience I have seen the necessity of it. I have seen, when a political question was introduced into a church deliberative assembly, that there were amendments offered, and, at last, a gentleman now within the sound of my voice poured oil upon the waters by means of a substitute, and saved that Convention from what many thought would be a most deplorable result, simply by offering a substitute which met the views of the whole House, and was carried unanimously.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Pittsburgh allow me to explain for a moment?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Certainly.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Just at that critical time, when there was an amendment to an amendment, all that that gentleman had to do was to rise in his place and ask the House to vote down the amendment to the amendment and also the amendment, and to state that he would then offer a substitute for the pending proposition. If the House was, when it was held up to it, in favor of taking that olive branch, let it go on decently and in order to reach that grand result. In such a case, I would vote against the pending amendment to the amendment and against the amendment itself, with a view of introducing a final substitute for the whole matter. What I object to is the crushing down of standing rules in order to reach a result before you are ready for it; not that I wish to prevent a substitute being offered. All you have to do is to vote down the amendment to the amendment and the amendment, and then, if your proposition be a substitute for the original proposition, come in with your substitute for it as an amendment; and, if you agree to that, then adopt the proposition as amended and you have achieved the entire result. There is no necessity to violate established rules in order to attain the result indicated by my friend from Pittsburgh.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. My answer to the gentleman is, that his proposition would not have met the difficulty in the case stated by me. The object was to avoid bringing the House to a vote on the amendments. It was most desirable that there should be a substitute for the whole which met the views of the whole. If the gentleman had been placed where some of us were then, he would have seen the importance of just such a motion as I now speak of. The gentleman can well understand that it is not always desirable, when a matter is before the House, that there should be a vote upon it. Some persons may wish, properly, to avoid voting in a way that, if the matter be forced upon them, they will be obliged to vote, if they have an honorable way of avoiding a vote. That was just the case which was presented.

I see no reason that the gentleman gives for the view he holds except a merely technical one, and that is that there ought not to be three amendments, that where there has been a second amendment we ought not to have a third, for fear of confusing the House and preventing them from seeing exactly what is before them. Practically, I think there is no difficulty at all. We all under-

stand what a substitute for the whole matter before the House is, and we all understand that where amendments are piled up one on the other, there may be confusion. I think any one of ordinary conception can see the difference between a third amendment and a substitute for the whole matter before the House. Of course that substitute must be germane to the matter then under discussion. We can not introduce a foreign matter under the form of a substitute; but if it is such a proposition as covers the whole ground, and if it is acceptable to the House as a whole, I see no reason why they should not have an opportunity of avoiding all the other questions which are presented to them and voting for the substitute as a whole. And when I was called upon yesterday to give the reason why this part of the old rule had been left out, I took it for granted (recollecting, according to my previous impression before the gentleman made the correction, what he had himself stated on the floor of the last Convention) that it had been left out simply because it was thought to be unnecessary, that it was the parliamentary law, and that therefore it was not necessary to encumber our rules with putting it in them. But in order to bring the House to a direct vote upon the matter to avoid all misconception with regard to it, I now move to insert that portion of the old rule which provides that, after an amendment to an amendment, a substitute may be offered for the whole matter before the House.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. That is my amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I hope the amendment originally submitted by the gentleman from New Jersey may prevail, and before I take my seat I shall move to reconsider the vote we have just passed, whereby the word "substitute" was stricken out, and, as I understood, "amendment" inserted.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. That is another matter.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Very well. I want the rule of the House to stand as it has been for years; and, with a great deal of deference, I must say that I differ from the statement of the gentleman from Virginia that the rule he stated is the universal rule. So far as my experience goes, the rule as now proposed is the ordinary rule. True, no deliberative bodies are bound absolutely by it. Different bodies have different rules. If the gentleman from Virginia will allow me to say so, the mistake into which he has fallen is in treating an amendment and a substitute as the same. A substitute is an amendment (all parliamentarians say that), but a substitute is much more than an amendment. It includes a great deal more than an amendment. It covers not only the two amendments that may have been proposed, but it includes somewhat if not all of the original proposition differently expressed. It is a readjustment of the whole subject-matter before the House, the original proposition, the second proposition, and the amendment to it, put in different shape, so that the House vote singly on all the questions, having the whole before them. The gentleman says this may be done in the way he states, but by what circumlocution does he propose to reach it? He says, you have a proposition before the House; you have offered to that proposition an amendment, No. 1; you have offered to that amendment an amendment, No. 2; but he says beyond that you cannot go; parliamentary law and usage do not authorize it, and the practical working of such a rule has demonstrated it not to be effective. He says, first vote down Amendment No. 2. The gentleman from Pittsburgh has most sensibly, in few words, explained that that very often ought to be avoided. It is not desirable often to vote on many questions. But the gentleman from Virginia then says, "Go

on and vote down proposition No. 1, and then you may bring forward your substitute." I ask the gentleman from Virginia, "Why go through that routine of these various votes, by Yeas and Nays, it may be, when, if you present a substitute involving in a different form of expression the whole proposition, the original resolution, and the two amendments, the House sees and understands the whole question in one chapter. It is like amending an act of the legislature by reference, instead of re-enacting the whole.

I say, then, that to save time, and in order that the members of the Convention may understand and know how they are voting, the old rule which we had and which is now proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey to be restored is the proper one, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I would ask my friend from Georgia if he proposes to amend a substitute. See, sir, how it puts the minority in the House in the hands of a majority. They say that they are indisposed to vote upon an amendment to an amendment; they are indisposed to vote upon the amendment as amended, but they will allow somebody to come in with an unamendable proposition springing from his own brain, or as the organ of a previous concerted majority, and throw that in as a log to crush down all pending propositions. I do not understand that any gentleman on this floor undertakes to vindicate this upon parliamentary principles, but it is vindicated upon the principle of carrying out the wills of majorities. I am of the opinion that rules are intended for the protection of minorities rather than the furtherance of the views of majorities. If there be a majority in favor of that which is indicated by a substitute, it is little enough for them to give the opportunity to the minority to record their votes in favor of the amendment to the amendment and the amendment as proposed before coming to the question of a general substitute.

Now, sir, the idea is that it prevents the House from coming to a vote on a delicate question. How does it prevent the House from coming to a vote on a delicate question? Suppose you introduce a substitute, what is that a substitute for? It brings the matter at once to a comparison between the substitute and the amendment to the amendment, and the amendment as amended, and the original proposition thus amended; and the House is bound to choose between them at one time or another; and it is wise to do it at the time when, according to parliamentary usage, the majority has the right to demand its voice to be carried out. I say that this proposition of an amendment to an amendment to an amendment—for it is nothing else—tends to confuse the House, tends to embarrass its judgment, tends to make it rush pell-mell to the conclusion which is sought to be carried by a majority influence or by the surprise movement of some distinguished and influential member.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia a question? Is a substitute, after it is adopted, subject to amendment?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. A substitute after it has been adopted may only be amended by way of addition to the text.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Is it not an answer to the argument of the Honorable Deputy that you can amend a substitute? You do away with the evils which the argument supposed would result from the adoption of this rule, because, if you can amend a substitute, then there is no occasion for apprehension.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Perhaps I did not understand what the gentleman's proposition was.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I ask if a substitute can be amended?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. No, sir. If you adopt a substitute for the entire matter, there is an end of it. You may add a new proposition by an independent movement, but if you adopt it finally as a substitute, that vote ends the question by way of action of the House on the original proposition.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I wish to ask a question of the gentleman. When a substitute has been adopted, is it not necessary to take another vote upon the original resolution as amended by the substitute; and cannot then an amendment to that, or an addition to that, be made by the House?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. You cannot alter the text of a substitute finally agreed to. You may add a new section to your bill, but if the substitute is designed to cover the whole matter the House never will desire to add anything to it.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. This House is asked to change an old rule. The old rule had in it the proposition now moved by the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey. It has been a rule of this House for a long number of years. If you will turn to the rules of the House of Bishops on the next page after our rules, you will see their rules, which have been before them for a long number of years, have in them the same proposition with respect to a substitute which we have always had in this House, and which is now proposed to be restored by the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey. It is a rule among business men, and I believe among clergymen, in case of doubt, to move slowly. The old rule has worked well. Why should we break away from our old rule in this particular? Why break away from the same rule as the House of Bishops? If there is doubt about it, stick to the old rule. It is safe to keep it there. There is no reason why we should adopt any new rule on this subject. It will throw us into confusion in that particular. It is safest to keep where we are. If we adopt this rule as proposed by the Committee, restoring the clause that was dropped out, as the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey proposes, we shall be in accord with the other House; we shall be in accord with the long-established usage of this House, and I appeal to the Convention to stand by the old rule in that particular.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. We have already passed a rule that no such motion as a substitute shall be entertained; and what we now witness is a very natural result of this attempt to create new Jefferson's or Cushing's Manuals by the General Convention. I think it is a very great mistake for us to spend our time in this way. We shall, after all, have to fall back on general parliamentary usage on all these subjects, and I think it will be sufficiently safe for us to do so. We have had a discussion on the subject of the previous question, which is recognized in Congress, and I believe there is about as much liberty of debate there as there is in any other deliberative body in the world, and it has never been found to be a "gag-law" there; but I know we have not had it here. I am for sticking to the old rules; but I do not see that we are called upon to make a body of parliamentary law at this time. We are only on the thirteenth rule of this series, and we have twenty-six, so that it will take us the first week of a three weeks' session to discuss the rules. I think this is a mistake.

I make these remarks at this juncture for the sake of deprecating this whole discussion upon questions of parliamentary usage. I can turn the attention of this House to a record that has been made in the Journal—I do not wish to be too definite whether it was at the last General Convention or the one before—where the ruling is directly opposite to Cush-

ing's book on the Practice of Legislative Assemblies. To that decision I, having at the time had something to do with the question, quietly submitted, because one of the most tremendous majorities was against me. I think it is a great mistake for us to continue this kind of debate and legislation. I hope after we act on this rule we shall not consume time on the others. When this is disposed of, I will vote for almost anything in the succeeding rules.

The PRESIDENT. I believe nearly all the other provisions are mere matters of course taken from the old rules. It will be necessary now under the amendment just adopted by the House that the action on the previous amendment in regard to the word "substitute," at the close of this rule, should be reconsidered.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I was about to make a motion that would cover that, and cover a little more ground. I now move to amend the rule by adding after the word "amendment," at the close, the words "or substitute," so as to read, "Under color of an amendment or substitute," because amendments not germane may be offered as well as a substitute. It will then read that a proposition shall not be changed under color of an amendment or substitute not germane to the subject.

The PRESIDENT. That would save the necessity of moving a reconsideration.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. We have now made the rule read.

"No proposition on a subject different from the one under consideration shall be received under color of an amendment."

I now move to add the words "or substitute," so as to read, "under color of an amendment or substitute."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment just moved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the rule as amended.

The rule as amended was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule as follows:

"14. In all questions decided numerically, the motion to reconsider must be made by one Deputy, and seconded by another who voted in the majority; or, in case of equal division, by those who voted in the negative; and in case of a vote by orders, where there is a concurrence of both orders, a motion to reconsider shall be made by a majority of a deputation from any Diocese of either order voting in the majority; and in case of a non-concurrence of orders, the motion to reconsider shall come from a majority of a deputation from a Diocese of that order which gave the majority in the negative; and in either case a motion to reconsider shall be seconded by a majority of any deputation of either order, without regard to its previous vote. And all motions to reconsider shall be made and seconded on the day the vote is taken, or the next succeeding day."

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I wish to move an amendment. It will be observed here that where a motion for a reconsideration of a vote numerically taken is made, it must be made and seconded by those who have voted in the majority, or where there is an equal division by those who voted in the negative, but where the vote is taken by orders it does not require the same. I think the rule ought to read alike in both cases. Therefore I submit this amendment: Strike out in the second line the word "one" before the word "Deputy" and insert in its place the word "a"; also, in the same line, strike out the words "and seconded by another," and also in the third line strike out the word "those" and insert instead the word "one," so as to read:

"In all questions decided numerically, the motion

to reconsider must be made by a Deputy who voted in the majority; or, in case of equal division, by one who voted in the negative."

In that case the same provision is made in voting numerically as in voting by dioceses and orders. Now suppose a question decided by a vote numerically by a majority of one, and suppose one who voted in the majority wishes to change his vote; he moves a reconsideration, but unless he can get another one to second him, so that finally when the vote came to be taken it would be carried by a majority of two on the other side, he cannot make the motion. In the case of a vote by dioceses and orders, a motion to reconsider may be seconded by a diocese or a delegation that voted on either side. Why should there not be the same rule in the case of a numerical vote? It seems to me it should be the same, and I therefore offer the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"15. The Reports of all Committees shall be in writing, and shall be received, of course, and without motion for acceptance, unless recommitted by a vote of the House. All Reports recommending or requiring any action or expression of opinion by the House shall be accompanied by a resolution for the action of the House therein."

The rule was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule, as follows:

"16. No business shall be introduced for the consideration of the House after the thirteenth day of its session, except by a vote of two-thirds of the members present."

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I suggest an informal amendment that the word "new" be inserted between "no" and "business," so as to read: "no new business."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Does not the word "introduced" imply that? You cannot introduce a thing that has been here before.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Suppose a message were to come down from the House of Bishops, that would be new business. It can do no harm to insert the word; it is the usual expression in all deliberative bodies. Certainly, if a message were to come down from the House of Bishops after the time limited in this rule, it would be new business, and we could not act on it under this rule without a two-thirds vote. As the word "new" clearly carries out the sense, and it can do no harm, I move to insert it.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the rule as amended.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Before this question is taken, I would like to make a single remark, and I would request the Convention to vote against this rule if they are willing to do so. It is an entirely new rule. It is not to be found in the old rules of the House, and, I think, never has belonged to the rules of the House from the beginning of our sessions. If it were not a new rule entirely, I should say nothing on the subject, believing that the House itself, by its own customs and usages, would establish such a modification of this rule that it would not work harshly. But it seems to me now it should not be adopted unless it is very evident that it is a necessary rule very important to the expediting of the business of the House. It is seen that it cuts off an important right to every member of the House, to introduce at any time during this session such business as he believes to be for the good of the Church and the glory of our Saviour. It seems to be harsh even in its provisions

in requiring that this limit shall be the thirteenth day. Our sessions generally are prolonged to the twentieth day. I have attended Conventions where its sessions have been longer than twenty days.

We are not, Mr. President, a parliamentary body, we are not a legislative body in the sense in which we speak of legislative bodies as connected with our States. It is true we are the legislative body of the Church. Are we to be governed, then, by the principles which prevail in Parliament? I know perfectly well that in many of the legislative bodies of our various States it is provided that new business shall not come in after a certain day. In some of them it is provided that if any person is going to petition the legislature he shall have his petition printed in a certain paper for a certain number of days before the session of the legislature is held at all. There are a great many bars put around to prevent business from coming in, except such business as must necessarily be passed upon. But we are not only Deputies from Dioceses who have come here to make laws, but we are brethren, representing brethren throughout the whole Church, brethren who are willing to do anything which shall really promote the glory of Christ and advance the interests of our Church.

Now, I can see very many instances in which, if we put such bonds upon us as this, we shall cut ourselves off, perhaps, from doing that which we ought to do, and which we would desire to do. It may be said, and it will be said, that two-thirds of the House may allow business to be introduced, but we all know that we cannot tell at once whether the business is important. We cannot present the business in such a way that it will appear important to two-thirds of the House, unless there has been considerable discussion upon it; and we know, moreover, that this would cut off a great many persons who are modest from bringing forward new business at all.

Besides this, there is the point which has been presented by one of the Deputies who has just spoken—I did not notice who he was—with reference to business coming down from the House of Bishops. The House of Bishops have no such rule as this, but they may have their new business come in on any day of the session. They generally are not ready to adjourn as soon as the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies is. Business coming down from the House of Bishops must be considered here, must be acted upon in some way. We may at any time be flooded with business from the House of Bishops; and yet you cut off every member of this House from presenting any new business.

There are various ways in which this new business may be turned aside. We may lay it upon the table; we may postpone it to the next Convention; we may postpone it indefinitely. We are not ourselves, because the new business is introduced, required to consider it at length, and debate it, and act upon it immediately. I would therefore suggest to the Convention that this rule, which may be parliamentary, and may be necessary for legislatures, is not necessary for this House; and being a new rule, we should go on through one session more without its adoption, for it will tie our hands in such a way that they cannot be untied except by this mysterious two-thirds of the House, and it may cut us off from very much business of importance.

As I said in the beginning, I should not attempt to say a word on the subject if this were not a new rule, and I can understand how my reverend father from Connecticut will immediately arise with a great many instances in which it would have been very desirable that we should not have had new business come in at a late hour, but I hope he will be more merciful in this matter.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President,

I hold that after this House have informed the House of Bishops, directly or indirectly, that they have completed their business and will be ready to receive them and to hear the pastoral letter and have the concluding religious exercises, the whole business of this House has been completed; and I am free to say that I have been shocked at the fact occurring no later than the last General Convention, that after a vote asking the House of Bishops when they would be ready to give the pastoral letter and to have the closing religious exercises, and after many members had gone away, not supposing any business would be transacted, some very important business was transacted. I know after I had left the House, and after several others had left, supposing no business was to be done, one canon was passed which had been negatived, but it came in a new form from the House of Bishops after the pastoral letter was read. It was a canon on the restoration of a clergyman who had been deposed, but that canon never has been acted upon, and I presume never will be acted upon; but I was shocked that at that late period of the session and after, according to usage, the House had resolved virtually to adjourn, any new business of that kind should come up. I must contend that there should be some limitation of the time when new business shall be started. I am not the man that will start up at the last moment to bring forward any new business. I do not know that I ever did it, although I now stand here for the sixteenth successive General Convention, since I first entered the House. I have seen the evil, and I say that there should be a line drawn. I would not say "after the thirteenth day," because we generally sit at least twenty days, but I would say that after the sixteenth day no new business should be considered except by a vote of two-thirds.

Bear in mind, Mr. President and gentlemen, that you have the power on the part of two-thirds to bring in new business at the last moment, and that is reasonable; but where new business is brought in by a bare majority, after that majority has been thinned out, you see the result of it. The result is that a Canon was passed at the last General Convention which would have been an evil—a gross evil—in the restoration of one man in one of the Western dioceses who had been deposed, and, I presume, will continue in his present deposition; but that Canon was made specially to reach that case. I protest against such legislation. I think it is dangerous to the Church. We must have some limitation.

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman from Connecticut move to change the time from thirteen to sixteen days?

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that amendment.

Rev. Dr. HASKINS, of Long Island. I move an amendment to that. I move that the rule be amended by inserting, after the word "the" in the second line, "after notice has been given by the House of Bishops that they are ready to adjourn."

The PRESIDENT. That would come under the principle of accumulating amendments.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The usual course is to send notice that we will receive the Bishops at a certain hour. The legislation to which I refer was at eleven o'clock at night, when I had left the hall, and a large number of Deputies had left, not supposing any other business would be attempted.

The PRESIDENT. The last amendment proposed entirely changes the character of the rule and is inadmissible. The question is on the amendment of the Deputy from Connecticut to strike out "15th" and insert "16th."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the adoption of the rule as thus amended.

The rule as amended was adopted.

The Secretary read the next rule of order, as follows :

"17. Whenever any nomination for a Missionary Bishopric, sent down from the House of Bishops, shall be under consideration, the House shall sit with closed doors."

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I think this rule also requires amendment. I know of no reason why we should sit with closed doors on a Missionary Bishop and not sit with closed doors on a Diocesan Bishop. When action is sent down from the House of Bishops upon the nomination of a Diocesan Bishop, and we have to consider it, it seems to me that the same reason which requires closed doors in the one case, should require closed doors in the other. Therefore, I move to amend by adding the following words after the word "bishops" in the second line, "or the subject of approving the testimonials or assenting to the consecration of any Bishop of a Diocese."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment that has been offered; on the contrary, I quite favor it; but there is still a very important matter behind this that I think ought to be considered at the same time. Though this Convention must sit in accordance with ancient Canons with closed doors when the characters of men are under discussion, as they are apt to be on such an occasion, still it is desirable that as manly men in the presence of our brethren we should have and expect to have the word of love made matter of perpetual record. On such occasions, if we sit with closed doors, it will always be possible for men to speak and not go on the record, unless we take some means to provide that they shall remain and be compelled to remain by the record which they have made for themselves. While in the Lambeth Synod, if it may be so called, as I trust it may, the Bishops there assembled felt that it would not be well that the record of their proceedings should be immediately made public, they took this course, that a stenographic report was made, and having been made it was kept until the time should arrive when it might with propriety be made public. Now, if we sit with closed doors, I believe the sense of this Convention is that though it may not be desirable that all that is said and done should immediately be reported to the world, yet in some way or other I think every word spoken here ought, as a matter of right to the candidates whose names may be under consideration, as a matter of historic verity and truth, to be recorded, to be preserved in some form. I do not know how to put what I desire in form, but what I ask is that this particular rule should for the present be postponed; that it should be remitted to some committee to frame an express rule for the order of this House at the time of the consideration of the confirmation of a Bishop-elect. I trust that whatever is done by this House will be done with closed doors in such a case, but with care that the record be preserved *usque ad litteram*.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, with regard to this matter, I propose to move a substitute for the whole—for the original seventeenth article of the rules of order, and also for Governor Stevenson's amendment. The substitute that I move is this: "When any subject whatsoever comes before this House necessitating the discussion of personal character, this House may, upon motion, resolve to sit with closed doors."

The reason that I move this is because there are two matters on hand. In the first place, when we examine the qualifications of any gentleman for any office in this Church, we have a perfect right to discuss his character in every way that we, as the

legislature of the Church, choose to do under the common rules of order; that is to say, under the rules of order and decency that become gentlemen. In the second place, it is perfectly manifest that all discussion of personal character of the candidates for any office whatsoever ought not to be open to the general public. I must honestly say that my soul has revolted at seeing the comments of the press upon gentlemen who came before various conventions as candidates for the Episcopate, and as candidates for other offices, for which they were scorned, despised, spat upon by men who were not fit to speak to them. I think that when a gentleman, clerical or lay, comes before us as a candidate for any office, or where his nomination has to be confirmed by us in any way, we should protect him from the remarks of the outside public, which outside public at the present time is largely irreligious, largely scorns not only the Church, but all belief in Christ. Therefore, Mr. President, not from any desire of speaking on the matter publicly, but simply from the desire to protect us of the clergy and us of the laity from that possibility, at the same time that we wish the most full discussion of character for all persons that come before us, I move this substitute:

"When any subject whatsoever comes before this House necessitating the discussion of personal character, this House may, upon motion, resolve to sit with closed doors."

I put it in the most general way because I am confident that this subject which I have started goes to the heart and feeling of all the clergy and laity that are in this Convention, and I do not believe that this, my substitute, will be the final form which the proposition will assume under the manipulation and discussion of the clergy and laity of this House, and therefore I put it in the widest way. I am satisfied that the whole thing is to be discussed here, and it ought to be decided on because I may honestly say that for the last twenty years I have seen reports of the discussions of the characters of men that came up as candidates for the episcopate by the nomination of their friends, and to my mind the way the characters of those gentlemen have been treated was perfectly disgraceful in every aspect in which you can look at it.

I will also say another thing: that if we, the General Convention, or the great National Council of the Church in the United States, could pass such a resolution as this, it would largely go down to the Diocesan Conventions, and would modify their action in a very great degree and cause a good deal more feeling of gentlemanly conduct among our diocesan conventions, and of the sense that each Christian and each gentleman ought to have of the character of any one who is a brother baptized and in communion with him in the Church.

I would say to the Convention that two things are by this resolution of mine attained: in the first place, the right to have the fullest discussion of the character of those who come up for office in the Church; in the second place, the right to keep off altogether the outside world. I look at it as one movement only towards that feeling that they had in primitive Christianity, that there were two great bodies on this orbit globe of ours, the World and the Church, and that with regard to the Church she should do her own business within her own borders, and keep out the world from interfering either with the scalding tongue or the sneering serpent-like sting with which the world both now and ever has been accustomed to treat all circumstances connected with the Church. My resolution is:

"When any subject whatsoever comes before this House necessitating the discussion of personal character, this House may, upon motion, resolve to sit with closed doors."

That I move as a substitute for the whole matter. Several DEPUTIES. The hour of adjournment has arrived.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The hour of adjournment has arrived, and I move that we adjourn.

The PRESIDENT. It is not necessary to move an adjournment, but a motion may be made to continue the session.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I make the motion. Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. But that motion must be made before the hour is reached.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The motion was made after four o'clock.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. No one but the Chair has a right to announce that the hour of four has arrived. Our watches may be different. Before the announcement was made, a proposition was offered to continue the session.

The PRESIDENT. I think the motion was made after the hour of four. The House now stands adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock A.M.

THIRD DAY.

FRIDAY, October 9.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at 10 A.M.

Morning Prayer was said by Rev. Horace Stringfellow, D.D., of Alabama. The Lessons were read by Rev. J. H. Hobart Brown, D.D., of Albany. The Litany was said by Rev. Robert W. Trimble, of Arkansas. The Benediction was pronounced by the Rt. Rev. William R. Whittingham, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Maryland.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.

The Secretary announced that he had appointed Rev. G. S. Mallory, D.D., of Connecticut, and Rev. C. L. Hutchins, M.A., of Massachusetts, second and third Assistant Secretaries respectively.

FOREIGN VISITORS.

Rev. Dr. SHELTON, of Western New York, submitted the following report :

"The Committee appointed to wait upon the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, and other English and Colonial clergy, now in attendance, beg leave to report that they have waited on his Lordship and the other clergy, and have received from them notice that they will be present in this House at two o'clock this afternoon."

LIST OF DEPUTIES.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on Elections respectfully report that certificates of election of Clerical and Lay Deputies of this House have been received from every diocese in union with this Convention, forty-one in number, and from the missionary jurisdiction of Oregon and Washington Territory and Dakota ; that they have found the certificates to be in due form, and have given to the Secretary a list of the names of those entitled to sit as members of the House, being the same as have been entered on the roll by the Secretary."

NEW DIOCESE IN NEW JERSEY.

The Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, from the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, submitted the following report :

"That the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, to whom was referred the memorial of the

Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of New Jersey, asking the consent of the General Convention to the erection of a new diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of New Jersey, respectfully report.

"That, having examined the documents submitted to them, and found them to be correct, they recommend the adoption of the following preamble and resolution :

"Whereas, A request has been presented to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, from the Diocese of New Jersey, that a new diocese be erected within the limits of the present diocese of New Jersey, the said diocese to be composed of the counties of Sussex, Warren, Morris, Passaic, Bergen, Hudson, and Essex, together with the township of Summit in Union County ; and

"Whereas, It appears by the official documents laid before this House that the Bishop and Convention of New Jersey have consented to the erection of the said new diocese, and that the requirements of Article V., of the Constitution, and also of Section III., Canon 6, Title 3, have all been met ; therefore

"Be it Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies do hereby consent to the erection of the proposed new diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of New Jersey, and that this House (the House of Bishops concurring) do also hereby ratify the formation of the proposed new diocese, and hereby recognize the union of said diocese with the General Convention, to take effect on the 1st of November next."

The PRESIDENT. What action shall be taken on this report ?

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I do not presume, sir, that it is necessary to go into the details as to compliance with the requirements, but one provision of Article V. is that the new diocese shall contain at least six parishes and six presbyters. The territory which it is proposed now to admit contains in the new diocese forty presbyters and fifty parishes. The old diocese must contain twelve presbyters and twelve parishes. The old diocese in this case contains fifty-six parishes and thirty-five presbyters. Provision is also required to be made for the adequate support of the Episcopate. Within a fraction of \$10,000 annual income is provided for the support of the Bishops of both the dioceses.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I move, sir, that the report of the Committee be adopted as the action of this House, and that the proposed division be agreed to. There is no doubt whatever of the necessity of it. The diocese is too large for a healthy Bishop, and I am sorry to say that our present Bishop is not in health to perform the duties properly, so that the division is a real necessity. I think, as a delegate from that diocese, as well as a member of the Committee on New Dioceses, that the request ought at once to be granted without hesitation.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. May I ask for the reading of that portion of the report which speaks of the 1st of November ?

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. No specific time was mentioned in the application, and the report was therefore at first couched in general language, "whenever duly organized and named in Primary Conventions ;" but it was thought better by the Bishop and the Committee who had the matter in charge, and as meeting the provision of the Constitution more perfectly, to name a specific date, as is usually done, and the date selected was the 1st of November next.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. May I ask whether the Committee, in acting upon this matter, had under consideration the canon which was passed at the last General Convention ? That provides that the Committee shall name the time, and that the

Diocese shall become united with the Convention as soon as its Primary Convention has been organized.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. Exactly; and the first report we drew up was to that effect.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Will the gentleman read the latter part of the resolution? I thought myself it was open to objection.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. We could not introduce both provisions.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I suggest to the Chairman of the Committee that, although we have not finally disposed of the whole list of rules, yet we have adopted many of them, and I suppose the House, as a matter of practice and convenience, will recognize the binding obligation of one rule already acted on, that reports from committees shall go upon the Calendar when made, and be taken up in the order in which they have been submitted after all the committees have been heard from. It will produce a great deal of confusion if, when reports are just made, debates spring up on them.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* (Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of Connecticut, in the Chair). We are acting under the old rule. We have not yet adopted the report of the committee proposing new rules.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I know we have not adopted the whole body of rules; but the practice of the House ought to conform to the idea suggested in the new rule, of which I have spoken, as a matter of convenience.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I move that this report be placed upon the Calendar in anticipation of the adoption of the new rules, probably to-day.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I submit that we cannot act under a rule which is but part of a series of rules for the government of this body, until the whole series has undergone consideration. Any rule already passed upon may be altered before we complete the series of rules.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Then, Mr. President, as it is likely the rules will be adopted to-day, providing, among other things, for a Calendar, and providing that that Calendar shall be taken up each day at 12 o'clock, I move that the further consideration of this report be postponed until to-morrow at 12 o'clock, and then it will properly come up on the Calendar.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. That amounts to the same thing as my motion.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I hope that this matter will not be postponed. There is no difficulty in regard to this case; it is very plain. It is a division of a Diocese containing 120 or more parishes, extending over a wide expanse of country, and the necessity of the division must be apparent to every clergyman on this floor; and unless some objection can be raised to it—and I have not heard a single one yet named—I think we can readily get rid of this matter and save the time of the House. I hope it will not be postponed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* The question is on the motion to postpone this report until to-morrow, and place it on the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I hold a copy of record from the Diocese of Texas, which is brought here in the shape of a memorial, accompanied by a resolution, referring to the proposed constitutional amendment allowing Dioceses too large to set off a portion into missionary jurisdictions. I do not propose to read the memorial, but will simply state that it commands the Deputies of Texas to urge the completion of this action and the amendment of the Constitution, so that a Diocese of vast territory may, by its own action when completed in

Convention, set off portions thereof into missionary jurisdictions. The resolution I will read:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the proposed alteration of Article V. of the Constitution, proposed in the last General Convention, and made known to the several diocesan conventions, and printed on page 360 of the Journal of the last General Convention, be, and the same is hereby, finally agreed to and ratified, as provided in Article IX. of the Constitution."

I move the reference of this memorial and resolution to the Committee on Canons, and I move it this morning because all other action pertaining to this matter must lay aside until this action is had.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. From the remarks made yesterday, there is no doubt in my mind that the House will this morning appoint a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I would therefore respectfully advise that the memorial be laid on the table until that committee be appointed, and that then it be referred to that committee.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I am willing to take that course.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Whenever it is the proper time, I shall make a motion to the effect that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I now move that it lie on the table for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLAS, of Mississippi. I have a memorial of the Diocese of Mississippi to present, and as it simply regards the so-called Nicene Creed, I ask to present it without reading, and move that it be referred to the proper committee.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The time for the order of the day has come.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move to suspend the order of the day, in order to receive memorials.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I suggest that it requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* The question is on suspending the order of the day, for the purpose of receiving and referring memorials.

The motion was not agreed to, there being, on a division, Ayes, 106; Noes, 64;—not two-thirds voting in the affirmative.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLAS, of Mississippi. Have I leave to present this memorial?

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* No, sir; the order of the day will now be proceeded with, being the consideration of the rules of order which were under discussion at the adjournment yesterday. The Secretary will read the pending rule and the amendment.

RULES OF ORDER.

The SECRETARY. The 17th Rule of Order, as reported, being under consideration, Mr. Stevenson, of Kentucky, moved to amend the same by inserting after the word "bishop," in the second line, the words, "or the subject of approving the testimonials or assenting to the consecration of any Bishop of a diocese." The Rev. Dr. Adams, of Wisconsin, moved to amend the amendment by striking out all after the number of the rule as reported, and inserting instead thereof the following words:

"When any subject whatsoever comes before this House necessitating the discussion of personal character, this House may, upon motion, resolve to sit with closed doors."

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I rise, Mr. President, to express the hope that the House will not adopt any rule of order which will require any portion of its proceedings to be carried on with closed doors. It seems to me that any such resolution or

rule of order is against the spirit of the age. The Clerical Deputy whose substitute is now immediately before the House, in the course of his remarks yesterday evening expressed the hope that our personal matters would be excluded from the world. Now, Mr. President, we cannot afford to disregard the world. Our mission, if I understand it, is to the world, and to the whole world, and nothing that we do can be indifferent to the world.

Another reason is, that publicity in our age and country is a great security. We all act under a sense of higher responsibility when we act in the presence of the public; and that is a guarantee of due consideration on the part of our body of the subject-matter of the character of those whose personal qualifications for positions in the Church may come before this House.

Again, I object to any rule of order demanding secrecy by this House, because we are well aware practically that the public will know, and does know, everything that the public cares to know. It is utterly futile to attempt to conceal from the public anything that is of sufficient importance for it to care to know. There is a constitutional provision by which the Senate of the United States has power to enforce its secrecy; but every man conversant with public affairs knows that it is utterly nugatory. The secret action of that body is divulged every hour, and transpires almost as soon to the public as it takes place, and the attempt at secrecy is only a source of misrepresentation, and adds to the embarrassment which the body is under. We know (contrary to the idea which a learned Lay Deputy expressed yesterday) that this rule of secrecy was introduced into the Senate for the purpose of having free discussion. It was not to prevent it. It was not to prevent an analysis, and a severe analysis, of the character of those who might be presented for office. It was to secure that very end. It was to encourage freedom of discussion with regard to everybody who should be presented for public trust.

Now, I regard our Bishops, or any other persons who are to hold relations with this Church, as holding a public trust; and, instead of excluding, we ought to invite the public to take an interest in our affairs and help us to do our work. The most efficient way to do this, as I understand the conduct of public affairs, is to act in the face of the public. Secrecy is at an end. If a subject is excluded from the public that the public cares to know about, it will be sure to find out all about it. A nomination ought not to be secret. Publicity is a guarantee of the best conduct. It is a responsibility under which everybody who holds public trust ought to act.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Mr. President, when this rule was first proposed, I was inclined to favor it; but upon subsequent reflection I am decidedly opposed to it, and for reasons which I will state briefly.

After the Revolution, the Church of England, in America, was organized under our present Constitution; and the House of Bishops from the beginning has always sat with closed doors, and this House has always sat with open doors. We have had one House sitting with closed doors all the time. That is sufficient to protect the Church in every department where we require secrecy. This is a legislative body. Each Diocese sends eight Deputies, four Clerical Deputies and four Lay Deputies, to this House to represent and legislate for the Church in this country. There is no reason why we should sit in secret session. They wish to know what we are doing. We have invited reporters here to make accurate reports of what we say and do. We wish, every one of us, that our constituents shall know what we say and do. We

do not wish to do anything behind the curtain, especially if that act should be the most important of any act during the entire session of the Convention. As has been well said by the honorable and learned Deputy from Maryland, the public opinion of the Church is the great guide of the Church; and how shall we know that public opinion, and how is it formed, except by our constituents reading and knowing what we say and do?

It is contrary to the whole spirit of our Church for this House to attempt to close its doors. The House of Bishops closes its doors, with no one inside but themselves and their Secretary. Suppose this House attempts to close its doors? The very first or second day of our session we adopted a resolution that the families of the Bishops and the families of the Clerical and Lay Deputies should have a gallery for their use during the entire session. We adopted a resolution that the representatives of our Mother Church of England, and of the Church in Canada, should come here and attend the sittings of this Convention. We adopted a resolution that all the ministers of Trinity Church in the city of New York should be invited to seats in this Convention, and to attend its sittings. We have invited the representatives of the Greek Church, who may be here, to attend our sittings. We have invited all the clergymen of this Church, all professors of the General Theological Seminary, and all the students, to attend all the sittings of this Convention. Now will you close the doors with all these in! [Laughter.] You cannot turn them out. It would be indecorous to turn our backs on our guests. We may close our doors here and involve ourselves in a discussion that may last one hour, one day, or one week. Where are our guests all the while? [Laughter.] It is entirely impracticable. If anything is to be done under such a rule, it must be referred to the Committee on Canons, and drawn out with details for executing it, and that may cover an entire page of the Journal. It cannot be done under a rule of three lines. It is entirely useless to attempt it. It requires details to carry out the idea.

Then, again, are we going to remove every member from that responsibility to the Church which we are under as to what we shall say here? The only reason for secret sessions of any body in this country and England is to remove members from liability for prosecution for slander and libel. That is the foundation of the whole thing. Do you wish to exempt yourselves from responsibility to God and to the Church and to the members of this Church for what we shall say here? No; I want to be responsible myself for all I say, and I want every other member to be under the same responsibility.

It has been suggested that we have a private reporter to report what we say, and that that report shall be laid away in the archives. Then we never could get at it; we never could produce his report; and the consequence would be, that each one would come out telling what his neighbor said, and every man would be misunderstood and misrepresented, whereas the reporters we have here will tell just what occurs, and we have something to protect us in the record they make.

I do not want A and B from each diocese to go and tell all I shall say in secret session; neither does any other Deputy want me to go out and state what he says. He and I would rather have the report of the reporters. That is accurate, and that is what we are willing to stand by. It is an easy thing for a clergyman to be misrepresented outside of a secret session, and to have it understood that he said so and so inside here, with nothing to protect himself except a report filed away in the archives where he cannot get at it, it being a thousand miles from his

home; but of what is said in open session he has a report made, he has the volume in his library at home, he has the whole thing before him, and that he stands by, and that he is willing to stand by.

I close with moving that the whole subject of rule seventeen, with the pending amendments thereto, be indefinitely postponed, and I hope we shall adopt the other rules.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Mr. President, I am opposed to this rule reported by the Committee, but I shall vote for the substitute of the reverend gentleman from Wisconsin; and I will briefly give the reasons for my vote.

I agree heartily with what has been said about secret sessions being obnoxious, and I agree further that it must be a very rare and extreme case where we should have a secret session at all; but every one must admit that there may be occasions, and it seems there will probably be one occasion, at least, during this session, when, not on our account, but on the account of the characters of some gentlemen whose names will be brought here, we should be able to give our reasons to each other without the public being present.

The gentleman from Illinois has given pretty fully the reasons for secret sessions, but he has omitted to state a very material reason which caused them to exist, commencing as far back as the origin of the grand juries of the country. There is no exception; they all sit secretly. Why so? Not only for fear of prosecution for the words used in debate in those bodies, but in all large bodies there are always timid men, men who will not speak out and avow their opinions openly and above-board as they would do when in secret session. To some extent, I think, this has been carried too far, and I hope the day is not far distant when our own House of Bishops will sit in open session under a general rule. I say, let the rule be for both Houses open sessions, except when the necessity is great upon us for secret sessions. What does the report of the Committee say? The report makes the rule of secret sessions apply whenever action on a Missionary Bishop is to take place. It makes it a rule that we shall necessarily go into secret session on such a nomination. To that I am opposed. I say it is an aspersion in advance on the character of every gentleman whose name shall come down to us as a missionary bishop. It presumes in advance that something obnoxious is to be said about that gentleman, whoever he may be, whose name is sent to this House; and therefore it is necessary in advance to declare that we will go into secret session to hear it. I am opposed to any such rule.

But what does the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin say? It leaves it in the discretion of the House, if, perchance, any question may come up which, according to the sense of the House, the intelligence of the House, the decency of the House, the respect for the character of other persons in the mind of the House, requires a secret session, to have a secret session.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Let me ask a question. Can we not do that at any time without a rule?

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I am coming to that. It is really unnecessary to have any rule on the subject; but the matter should be left to the discretion of the House, and it should require a separate vote on each occasion to say that we shall close our doors. I take it that even without any rule on the subject, without this 17th rule as reported by the Committee, or the substitute offered by the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin, this House at all times by a vote—probably it would require two-thirds—can have a secret session. I am told by a gentleman that it has been done heretofore.

Any man's common sense should tell him that it can be done.

The great thing I want to get at is to leave this question on the necessity of the case. I do heartily hope that the substitute will be adopted, and that the report of the Committee as Rule 17 will be voted down.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question in this case in regard to closing the doors is very easily adjusted. I understand the question is, whether we shall sit with closed doors when a nomination comes here for a missionary bishop; that is to say, shall we consider the nomination with closed doors in reference to the character of the nominee? There is a way of settling the matter, which, it seems to me, will remove the necessity for closed doors, and that is by the ballot; and I submit that the ballot of this body in regard to a candidate for a missionary bishopric will not be changed essentially by discussion. Members of this body, when they come to consider the propriety of agreeing to the nomination of a missionary bishop, will have made up their minds without having heard discussion. The information of each member in regard to any one who is nominated is usually full. It does not require discussion; there is sufficient information without it; and the effect of balloting is really and effectually equivalent to acting with closed doors. I am opposed to the principle of closed doors, usually because I think it is not a necessity. I think it is contrary to all our previous practice, and contrary to the principle recognized by this Church in giving publicity to everything it does; and every man who represents the Church here should stand up faithfully and assume the responsibility, if necessary, of saying such things as he ought to say conscientiously in each case. Therefore I hope we shall not sit with closed doors.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. Mr. President, before this substitute is acted upon I should like to improve it a little by a slight amendment. It says "whenever the discussion of personal character." Now, sir, a man may have a very good character indeed, but may lack qualification. I move, therefore, after the word "character" to insert the words "or fitness."

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Is a substitute amendable?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair does not understand that the pending question is a substitute; but an amendment to an amendment.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I wish to say that the first action was the moving of this article or Rule 17. Then there was an amendment brought forward to that by Gov. Stevenson, of Kentucky, I understand, and then I moved a substitute for the whole, and I understand that is a substitute, not an amendment. Then I understand that the gentleman from Illinois, Judge Otis, moved an amendment, which is now before the House.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. No, I moved an indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would like to know whether the gentleman from Delaware is right, whether the discussion is on an amendment or a substitute, whether Dr. Adams' proposition is regarded as an amendment or substitute. The Secretary will read the record.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. It was taken as a substitute last night.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It cannot be a substitute, as the reading of the record will show.

The SECRETARY. The journal reads:

"The 12th rule of order being under consideration,

"Mr. Stevenson, of Kentucky, moved to amend the same by inserting after the word 'Bishop,' in the

second line, the following words: 'Or the subject of approving the testimonials or assenting to the consecration of any Bishop of a diocese.'

"Rev. Dr. Adams, of Wisconsin, moved to amend the said amendment by striking out all after the number of the said rule, as reported, and inserting instead thereof the following words, to wit:

"When any subject whatsoever comes before this House necessitating the discussion of personal character, this House may, upon motion, resolve to sit with closed doors."

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I want to say a few words, Mr. President, because it seems to me that, in the hurry of taking this question, it is placed on the wrong basis. I think this is the most important rule of order that has been submitted to us for adoption.

I do not understand with the gentleman from Maryland that this Church owes any allegiance at all to the outside world. I do not understand that the country has resolved itself into a jury, or into a political body to watch our conduct in this General Convention. Nor do I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that it is more proper to take an individual case, and make that case odious by moving a suspension of the General Rule and putting the House in secret session, thereby inviting the suspicion of the country on the candidate for the Episcopacy, than it is to have a standing fixed rule to which all must yield alike. I understand that the assent of this body on certain occasions is necessary to the consecration of a Bishop, and I understand that the duty of giving a certificate on that question implies a duty to inform ourselves as to the qualifications, the fitness, the wisdom, the gravity, the learning, the piety, the eloquence, the prudence, and the good sense of the gentleman who is named; and on such an occasion as that, what is it that we are to certify?

"We, whose names are underwritten, fully sensible how important it is that the sacred office of a Bishop should not be unworthily conferred, and firmly persuaded that it is our duty to bear testimony on this solemn occasion without partiality or affection, do, in the presence of Almighty God, testify that A. B. is not, so far as we are informed, justly liable to evil report, either for error in religion or for viciousness of life, and that we do not know or believe there is any impediment on account of which he ought not to be consecrated to that holy office; but that he hath, as we believe, led his life for three years past piously, soberly, and honestly."

This recognizes the duty on our part to enquire—not to enquire for the satisfaction of the outside world, but to enquire for the satisfaction of our own consciences, and so as to perform our duty to the Church; and we cannot enquire satisfactorily—we cannot put gentlemen upon their honor on the stand here before the world and a thousand reporters. We do not invite the world to come into these family councils of ours. It would be as absurd to invite the world to come and hear our discussions upon the learning and personal qualifications and personal fitness of a candidate for the Episcopate as it would for a gentleman who has a marriageable daughter, and a proposition is made for a union with her, and he has a council with his wife at night on the question, to invite the public to hear what each says to the other in regard to the fitness of the man who proposes to become a member of their family. A gentleman's name is sent down to us in nomination for the Episcopacy. One may think he has not learning; another that he has not sobriety of conduct; another that he has not prudence and discretion; another that he has not wisdom; another that he has not the unction that belongs to a Bishop. Must a man be called upon to arraign his friend here,

it may be his bosom friend? Must he be called before the world to make an attack upon him? I say this is a family of brethren, under the highest obligation of fidelity to each other, but at the same time the highest obligation of fidelity to the Church; bound to speak the truth, but to speak in love, and not proclaim it to the world. Many a man is not fit to be a Bishop who, nevertheless, has a good character. A friend might be compelled to say, upon his conscience and his honor, in secret session, that he did not believe his friend was best fitted for that high office. I do not understand that the veil of secrecy is drawn over this body for the purpose of protecting it against prosecution for libel. It is to protect our actions for the good of the Church, and not for our personal selves, in order to get at the truth. Gentlemen who speak of a brother under such circumstances must know that when they utter a word it will not be printed in the newspapers and telegraphed over the face of Christendom. Therefore I say that this rule touches us more nearly than any other rule which has been offered for our adoption, and it is a rule, in my opinion, calculated to preserve the purity of the Episcopate.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Mr. President, the gentleman who has last spoken has anticipated me in some things that I intended to say. I quite agree with him that this is one of the most important rules of order which we can have.

During the recess of this General Convention testimonials in favor of Missionary Bishops-elect and Diocesan Bishops-elect go before the different standing committees throughout our country. Do those standing committees open their doors and let into their councils the outside world as spectators? And will this larger body think of doing what the standing committees do not do? I am in favor of the rule as proposed to be amended by the gentleman from Kentucky. I do not like the ingenious mosaic piece which the gentleman from Wisconsin has introduced here. If it be important to have a rule of order, let us have it in plain Saxon language so that everybody can understand it, and that we shall not be misled. This rule of order is not one which concerns our general deliberations. We may well open our Convention generally to spectators. We have admitted various persons here, but we have not admitted them to a conference upon the personal character of gentlemen who may be proposed for the Episcopate. I trust we are making a rule of order not for this Convention alone but for future Conventions. I know nothing about what may come up under this rule of order at the present Convention, and I care nothing about it. What I want is a rule of order to guide us now and hereafter, and guide us in wisdom.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I desire to say, Mr. President, that I shall advocate some rule which will enable this House to consider candidates for the episcopate in secret session; and I say that because it lies within my own knowledge, and I am happy to say within the knowledge of very few other members of our Church, that there is now a member of the Clerical Order of our Church who in long years gone by was guilty of a grievous crime, and, I will add, grievously has he answered for it. I would not willingly bring up that heinous offence from its dead forgetfulness of years; but if the name of that gentleman were before this Convention to be confirmed as a Bishop of our Church, I should feel it my conscientious duty to lay before this House what I know of the past years of his life. If I am compelled to be put in a position of that kind, I desire to communicate the fact to as few members of the Church, and to only members of the Church, as may be necessary to pre-

vent his assuming the office of Bishop. I have no doubt he has repented, and sincerely repented, of the offence of his early years; but if he were before us as a candidate for Bishop, I should say he was unfit, and if the time should come my lips must be unsealed, and I should announce to this House the reasons why I should oppose him.

For this reason, I say, I desire to vote for some rule—and I do not care whether the one proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, or the one offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin—some rule which will enable this House to sit in secret session upon the character of candidates who come before it.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, before I begin, I should like to state clearly what I want to speak about. In the first place, I am entirely opposed to the amendment introduced by my brother from Wisconsin (Rev. Dr. Adams). In the next place, I am entirely opposed to the amendment to the amendment of the Deputy from Kentucky (Mr. Stevenson); but I am not opposed to the rule of order, which I am prepared to vote for. The rule of order provides that this House shall go into secret session with regard to the election of a missionary bishop. That rule has prevailed in this House. I believe it has been the rule of this House to go into secret session whenever a missionary bishop was to be voted upon; but whenever a man has been elected by a diocese and his name has come before the House, it has always been acted on in open session, and there is a reason for this difference. The one is the confirmation of a man already elected to an office, and the other is the election, and the two states are altogether different. To confirm is one thing, and to elect is another. Of course, when we go into an election for a bishop, it is very necessary that many things should be entered into. It is not only his doctrinal qualifications, his personal qualifications, his moral qualifications; but when a man is called upon to vote for a bishop he may have a great many other things to think of. Various things may come in question. Therefore, it is very proper that when a bishop is to be elected, his qualifications should be freely discussed; but when a man has been already elected by a diocese, when all these discussions have been gone through with, when he is sent up to this House not for election but for confirmation, the whole range of enquiry is narrowed down. It seems to me it is narrowed into these two things—first, his doctrinal qualifications; and, secondly, his moral qualifications. Is he a heretic? or is he unfit morally? and those are very grave questions. When those things do come up, if ever they do, for discussion, it seems to me they ought to be discussed in the very light of day. The discussion ought not to be in secret session. It ought to be with the eyes of the whole world upon us, with the eyes of the Church upon us, with the sunshine shining in. If the person cannot be here to defend himself, at least he ought to have an opportunity of knowing what is said against him. I believe there were only two bodies in this world that ever discussed such questions with closed doors, and those were the Star Chamber and the Inquisition. If we are going to discuss the qualifications of a man as to heresy or as to moral fitness, let it be done openly and in the presence of all men; and what my brother from the Diocese of Georgia said a moment ago is the more convincing. He said that there is somebody somewhere among the clerical orders who has been guilty at some time in his life of a terrible crime. He said, if that gentleman were to come up here for discussion, it would be his duty to bring forward something like that. What! Is a clergyman to be put on trial here without anybody to defend him, subject to what may be said in secret, with nobody to take his part excepting those who

may chance to be here, no lawyer to defend him or anything of that sort? In such matters, let the charge be made in broad daylight and above-board.

But, Mr. President, the rule of order provides that, in the case of the election of missionary bishops, the action shall be with closed doors, for the reason that it is an election and not a confirmation. The House of Bishops nominates to us, and we elect; and therefore, it seems to me eminently proper that in the one case we should sit with closed doors, and that in the other case we should sit with open doors; and so I am going to vote for the rule of order and for no amendments to it; and particularly I am opposed to the amendment of the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin for this reason. A rule of order, if I understand it, is a rule that is made for the daily orderly governance of the House. It is that our business may be facilitated and that it may be done with the more readiness. Now, do we want a rule of order which says that whenever this House goes into the consideration of questions affecting a man's personal character we shall sit with closed doors, as though that was generally one of the ordinary businesses of this House? We do not come here for any such purpose. We may have to do it, I suppose; but it is a very rare exception, and we do not want any rule of order on the subject, because this House can always go into secret session if it wants to do so.

Therefore I oppose both amendments, and am prepared to vote for the original rule of order.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I have during the course of my life seen the great evil of discussing personal questions in relation to the Episcopate in the House of Deputies, with a promiscuous assemblage. I expect auditors on ordinary occasions to be present; but not on such an occasion, for I have felt from time to time the necessity of these discussions taking place with closed doors. I felt it at the last General Convention when a nomination was sent us.

I would ask my Rev. Brother from Wisconsin if an election by dioceses is the conclusion of the matter, what do we do here? I would, moreover, ask him, is a diocese more competent to make an election of a bishop than the whole House of Bishops? He is willing to draw a distinction between a missionary bishop nominated by the House of Bishops and a diocesan bishop nominated—that which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet—"elected," he calls it, I say "nominated," because every man nominated by a diocesan convention has to pass two other bodies, either the standing committees, who always meet in secret session, or this House and the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Do you want an answer?

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I do not ask an answer; but, when I am done, if you want to give any light on the subject, you may do so. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Rev. Dr. Adams), simply because of one word in it. If he would consent to change that word, it would entirely alter my whole course. I never want a rule of order in an important matter of this kind which has "may" in it. I want a "shall," and that takes away all the odium of the motion to close the doors which I had to endure at the last General Convention; but, thank God, I scarcely heard a dissenting voice then. But when the orders of the day came up the day after, a motion was made to act with open doors. Why? Because it was said of the outside public they wanted to be present and hear all that was said. A motion was made to reconsider that resolution for the purpose of having it rescinded.

That motion, by a tremendous majority, I believe, was voted down. It happened that the House of Bishops withdrew the nomination because the Rev. Brother who was then nominated for Africa was an important member of the Board of Missions, and especially of the Committee on Foreign Missions, and he was retained, until at last wisely the Bishops sent him to the Indian district; and then how was their action met? In secret session, by standing committees. Take the elections of diocesan bishops, as they are called elections; if they had been elected six months before this Convention met, how would they have been disposed of? In secret session by the standing committees; but now forsooth we are the committee to act, and we are afraid to act ourselves.

Another thing I want to say to my reverend brother from Wisconsin, and to every gentleman who has objected to this rule; and it is, that I have a conscience, and, so help me God, I never will sign the testimonial of a man for a bishop until I am clear and conscientious in saying before God, in whose presence I may very soon appear, that I believe him fit for a bishop.

We have had in the House of Deputies three instances of men elected as Bishops being sent back. There was the case of Mr. Ogden, of Trinity Church, elected the first Bishop of New Jersey in 1795. A question arose and in this delicate way it was brought up; and finally the House wisely got rid of it by sending him back to his own diocese, and nothing was afterwards heard of him. A similar case took place in 1844, *quorum pars fui*. I was much censured for the course I pursued, I know, but not by my conscience, and, I trust, not by my God. It was the case of one of the dearest friends I had in the Church, and I thank God that the course I then pursued never lost me his friendship, but he had the magnanimity to honor me for it, and to the day of his death he was my bosom friend. I loved him, and I love his memory. I allude to the late Dr. Francis L. Hawks. In 1844 his name came before the Convention. All of us who ever heard him know his eloquence—the silver tones united with the diapason of his voice—and we know also his ingenuity. He made a speech, and if the question had been taken at that moment the House was not in a condition under his speech to act upon it. It adjourned wisely. I went to my lodgings and communed with none but my God. I knew facts which I thought ought to be fatal to my friend, so that he should never be consecrated Bishop of Mississippi or a Bishop in the Church, with all his talents. I deliberated; I spent a sleepless night. I came to the House next day, sitting in St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia. I was Secretary of the House at the time. I said to the President, "Sir, as soon as the House is ready for business and the order of the day is to be taken up, will you give me the floor?" "I will, sir," he replied. I performed my duty as Secretary, and then came down from the vantage-ground of the platform to the middle aisle, and I said what I knew and what would prevent me from signing the testimonials. Nay, in my usual forcible way when I want to express a thing strongly, I said, "Sooner than I would sign those testimonials I would lay my hand upon the block and let a butcher with his cleaver sever it from my body." I am not calculated for a stump-orator. [Laughter.] "Then," said I, "I would hold up the bleeding stump and say, 'Forbear! forbear. Do not sign the testimonials of this man.'" He was my friend. My heart bled that I had to say it; but I had a conscience, and I have a conscience yet, I thank God, and I trust I shall carry it clear and pure as possible, sanctified by the blood of the Redeemer, at the last day before the judgment-seat of Christ.

On these grounds, I say, let us have a rule which shall make it imperative; and if a case be so clear and distinct as not to require a session with closed doors, a two-thirds vote of the House will suspend the rule for the occasion; but let us have a rule so that others shall not be put to the necessity which I have been put to, of standing forth to be censured by many persons as a bold, daring, impudent man, because I have a conscience and I am sent here to exercise that conscience in behalf of the Church. I would lay down my life for the Church; but I will never sacrifice my conscience while the Church requires me to act for it.

The Senate of the United States, when the President sends them a nomination, close their doors. Why? Because the character of the individuals, their fitness for office, is to be discussed. I hold, further, that in all deliberative bodies acting in secret session, everything transacted is *sub rosa*, and no man, without violating every principle of a deliberative body in secret session, can whisper to his dearest friend outside what was said inside. I want to have the opportunity to express my opinions—if I have them adverse to a nomination, freely; if I have them in favor, freely—before I sign a testimonial either for a missionary or a diocesan bishop. Therefore, I say that, if my brother from Wisconsin (Rev. Mr. Adams) will alter his proposition to "shall" in all cases, I will most cheerfully accept his substitute and vote for it, and entreat every member of the House who has a conscience, and feels that he has it, to act, not before *οἱ πολλοί*, the multitude, although they be the families of clergymen. It is said of the families of clergymen that sometimes they make the worst citizens in the world [laughter], but because they are the families of clergymen and we have authorized them to come here during our public sessions, it will not do to say that we cannot have any secret, private conference. That is a perfect absurdity, and it must commend itself to every man present as an absurdity, and I hope that, by a large vote, that principle will be voted down, and that we shall adopt this rule of order.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I am perfectly willing to accept the verbal alteration proposed by the Rev. Dr. Mead.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, when aged men recount the exploits of their youth, it becomes younger persons to keep silence and to wonder and admire; and yet I have no doubt that a marvelling and wondering Church has, ever since the year 1844, marvelled that any body of men should have rejected from its Episcopacy, even though the reverend gentleman from Connecticut was the leader of the movement, a man who holds so high an estate in the memories of the Church as the Rev. Francis L. Hawks, LL.D., who sometime was the historiographer of this Church. But the reverend gentleman from Connecticut did not mention one fact which made his argument not quite as plausible as it seemed. All that bravery of his was exhibited in open session. If he had a conscience, he was not afraid to speak it out; and so I say, Mr. President, let us follow his good example in that respect, even if we cannot agree with his judgment in the other.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I understand that the suggestion made by the Clerical Deputy from Connecticut has been adopted. Am I right?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. (Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia, in the Chair.) Yes, sir.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Then, as a rule, it will be obligatory in every case, if it be passed?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unless two-thirds dispense with it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I will omit the

word "upon motion," so as to read "shall sit with closed doors."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I chanced to be in the Convention referred to by the Clerical Deputy from Connecticut. The impression made there upon the community was such that I am satisfied every gentleman present in this Convention will vote for sitting with closed doors on such occasions. I remember the argument then, and especially do I remember the argument of Horace Binney. It made a deep impression, and one of the most painful character.

But I think the House is prepared to vote. I will merely ask them to recall the experience of three years since when we decreed to sit with closed doors. Those who were present can easily recall the testimony that was borne there to the character of the gentleman who was under consideration, but whose health was such that we concluded to ask the House of Bishops to withdraw his name. All that discussion is fresh to the minds of many here, and I am sure the experience we gained three years since, that induced the Committee to bring in this amended rule, will enable us now to vote in favor of making it a permanent rule.

Mr. BRUNE, of Maryland. Mr. President, I would say a word or two on this subject. I am very unwilling to speak upon any question, as this House may understand, for I am sure I am very little known to most of the members. But there is a point that has not been presented by the able gentlemen who have already spoken, clerical and lay, to which I beg to call the attention of the House; and that is this: We have first the choice of the present amendment of the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin. That has been changed this morning at the last moment, whether rightfully or wrongfully, according to parliamentary usage, is a matter of no importance to me; it has been changed in a most important respect by the substitution of a single word, "shall" for "may," changing the whole aspect of the question, as will be seen at once. Now, what is the effect of this change? The effect is to completely overturn the rules that we have hitherto been governed by. The objection, before the change, to the measure of the Rev. gentleman was that it seemed to be unnecessary, because we may by a special resolution or order provide for closing the doors on any occasion, and do it by a simple majority, whereas to change a rule, according to the rules we have begun to adopt to-day, would require two-thirds. If we had adopted his substitute with the word "may" in, I presume it would authorize us, as a rule of order, when a question of character was before the House, by a simple majority vote, to sit with closed doors. And what would be the effect of that? It has been described by the learned Deputy from Illinois. Look at the broadness of the question. Whenever character is involved, we shall sit with closed doors. It seems to me the answer to such a proposition is the mere statement of it. Suppose it is "may," the objection to that is that the rule can be suspended; we can sit with closed doors by a vote of two-thirds upon any question whether of character or not. Then why shall we have a standing rule upon the subject. That presents the question as it stood under the old rule, and as it is proposed to be amended by my distinguished friend from Kentucky; and it seems to me, in spite of the eloquent language of the Deputy from Wisconsin (Rev. Dr. De Koven) that the Deputy from Kentucky was wise in his amendment. In spite of the language of the most eloquent gentleman from Wisconsin, I think there is no fair, clear distinction between our action upon a bishop

elected from a diocese and coming here with the endorsement of a diocese, and upon the nomination by the House of Bishops of a missionary bishop. I, for one, say that either is not a recommendation to me, but is conclusive, unless there are some hidden circumstances, such as have been touched upon by the venerable gentleman from Connecticut, that would induce the House to go against such certificates.

But now we come to the question whether there should be any rule at all upon the subject; and on that point I say that I occupy a different ground from the most eloquent member from Wisconsin. I see no substantial distinction between the case of a missionary bishop and the case of an elected diocesan bishop, and therefore the enquiry is whether we should have a standing rule at all which makes it imperative that we should sit with closed doors whenever we have to deal with such a question. We ought not to assume that any diocese will elect any man without going fully into his qualifications; and we are, as it were, bound to accept that as the most substantial, if not conclusive, proof of fitness. So in the other case, when a missionary bishop is sent down to us from the House of Bishops, you and I are to enquire as to the propriety of that nomination. We can do either one of two things on such an occasion. We can provide, when it arises, for an emergency. I would not anticipate it now, and I would not provide any general standing rule for such an extraordinary case as has been touched upon. I was not old enough to be in the Convention which dealt with the case of that most distinguished Presbyterian, who perhaps has had honor in the Church quite as large as if he had been upon that occasion confirmed as a Bishop. But I say, if there should such a case occur again, we can deal with it in one of two ways, which are both simple and without the slightest difficulty. If two-thirds of the House think upon such an occasion that we should sit with closed doors, either in reference to a missionary bishop or in reference to a diocesan bishop, we can do so; but I for one cannot see why the bold, independent, eloquent, and revered Presbyterian from Connecticut cannot just as well do his duty in the sight of God and before this Church with this House sitting on such an occasion with open doors, as after a motion to sit with closed doors. If there should be such an occasion again—which I trust there never will be—I should say it was a case where everything that should be said should be openly said, and not be liable to the slightest misconception.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Mr. President, I had intended to say one word in relation to the memory of the venerable and beloved Dr. Hawks. The absence of the Deputy from Connecticut prevents my adding a few words of a historic character relative to that convention to which he referred. Not wishing to prolong this discussion, and he being absent, I forbear the remarks I had intended to make.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, I have no purpose of entering into the character, canonically speaking, of the action of the House of Bishops or of this House in the election of a missionary bishop. Neither do I intend now to call the attention of this House to the decided distinction there is between the election of a bishop by a diocese, and his subsequent confirmation by this House, as distinguished from the gift of jurisdiction which can only be conferred by the Provincial Synod of Bishops of this National Church. These things I shall pass over. I also pass over all the reasons why at the election of bishops secrecy ought to be maintained, at least during the session of those who elect him. That I may speak of hereafter, but not now.

I merely appeal to universal human experience. I find that the great Council of Laodicea (whose Canons were confirmed, and so became of ecumenical authority at the great Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon) enacted that elections should always be held in private, and that was the summing up of the experience of the Church in all her provinces throughout Christendom for centuries. I need not point the learned gentlemen of this House to the facts of ancient primitive history. We know that then as now men were men with a strong spice of the old Adam in them. We know that then as now there were irregularities that made the faces of men blush. We know that what happened then may happen now, if it has not happened in this Church; and I call on the reverend clergy here present, and also the honorable laity, to say whether that experience of the Christian Church then, and never contradicted to this hour, it is worth while for us deliberately to reject.

One other thing. It is the experience of parliamentary bodies, as I am informed—I never had the honor to belong to any of them—that they find, when nominations are sent to them, that decency, expediency, courtesy, require that they should sit with closed doors. I ask, then, the members of this House whether in a matter so grave, so delicate, so complicated, so infinite in the questions it may bring up, as that of the fitness of a man to exercise the office of bishop in the Church of God, it is not best to ignore the gay, careless spectator, and whether we ought not to handle the subject with the delicate tenderness of fathers, or rather of brethren? At the same time, I must say that I am unwilling in this matter to leave personal character to the expressions of two classes of men who have been alluded to on this floor. One class is the timid men. God help the timid men who need the courage of secrecy to tell the truth. Men have no right to be timid in this House. I honor the noble Deputy from Connecticut for what he has said as to how in bitterness of soul he was compelled to resist the election of his own friend. I honor him for it, and I honor no man who would not do the same. There is another class, however, whom I would defend from themselves. I should not say that the fact existed if it had not already been alluded to on this floor. It is the class of men who talk wildly, who are ready to bring in careless accusations received from anonymous witnesses, perhaps in ways they would dislike to tell. Sir, I want the secret session upon this subject, but I want also a record of every word, of every syllable here spoken, for it is unhappily the case that any man standing upon this floor, even if he were a member of it, chosen bishop of a diocese, would be regarded as being guilty of an indiscretion if he were to defend himself on this floor; it would seem to unfit him for a bishopric. We know what has been said on that subject. I trust that such a thing may not be necessary. In the case of a missionary bishop who might not be upon the floor at all, it would be still worse. He has no chance whatever of saying what he has to say in his own defence. I would have the record here stenographically preserved as I said yesterday, *usque ad litteram*, that he might have it to defend himself elsewhere if not here, so that when the mitre is not his, and he can no longer be suspected of bidding for its honor, he may nevertheless have the right of vindicating his doctrinal character as a priest, his personal character as a man. I, therefore, trust that the amendment of the honorable Lay Deputy from Kentucky will prevail, and then I trust this House now or at a later hour will provide for keeping a stenographic report of its secret debates.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask your indulgence and that of this House for

one moment. I think one point made by the venerable Dr. Mead, of Connecticut, was conclusive as regards the analogy between this General Convention and the Standing Committees. It is perfectly conclusive to my mind. But one point escaped him, a fact of history which I know he will recollect as soon as I call his attention to it. It happened in 1847, when the Diocese of Illinois sent the name of a gentleman here, as elected to be Assistant Bishop of that Diocese. Character was not at all involved, but there were certain points. I do not wish to go over those points, but they in no way touched the character of that gentleman as a man of God, as worthy to work in the Church of God, but still, in the judgment of the General Convention, it was thought that he ought not to be confirmed as a bishop. These things being openly spoken would not have injured his character, but might have injured his influence in the position in which he then was, and yet those points influenced the General Convention. The world outside would not have looked upon him in the same way in certain matters, but his character was perfectly unimpeached, as it was unimpeachable. The case was that of the Rev. Mr. Brinton, who was in 1847 sent here by the Diocese of Illinois. I believe then, if the General Convention had sat with closed doors, it would have been better. I adduce this circumstance simply to say that I am in favor of the original rule as proposed to be amended by the gentleman from Kentucky, and I am not in favor of confining it to the specific point of character. I do not think that character is necessarily involved, but it may come in; but there are a great many other points which also may come in, and which we can here discuss better amongst ourselves. It is not to protect ourselves, but to protect a clergyman who ought to be protected because he is worthy of all honor except that of the Episcopate. For this reason I shall go for the original rule of order as amended by the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise simply to take exception to an assertion which was positively made here by the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania—namely, that the secret session held in Baltimore was in all respects satisfactory. I speak in the presence of many who were Deputies to that Convention, and I assert that the character of that secret session was not satisfactory to very many of us. I call others to bear me witness that the turn which the debate took was regarded as very unfortunate, and that there were cries of protest from members on the floor as to the assertions which were being made. And, sir, I say here in this Church that I left that House pained with the character of the discussion, and pained by the influences which were brought to bear there to prevent our going into an election when the name of a godly, learned, and noble man had been sent down to the House. I left the church building with pain, and I then vowed that I never would agree to go into such a secret session again. This is all I have to say.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. Mr. President, I have a word to say as to the practical bearing of this question. You may close your doors, but here is a great assembly, and how will it be possible for them to conceal or keep secret what shall be here spoken? It would be better to speak it openly at once. If I have occasion to speak of the character of a person here nominated by the House of Bishops or sent here by a diocese, I would much rather that my words should go correctly to the public as sent forth by the reporters, who are making such excellent reports of our doings, than go to the world through the garbled form in which what is said will otherwise necessarily be scattered abroad.

It is not possible for us to accomplish the object

which is intended to be accomplished by the closing of the doors. Gentlemen talk about the world as though the world came in here. The world is a very wide world. The Church is a very wide Church. And who is this world that comes in here? I suppose the audience in the galleries, and those who come in as spectators, are as much entitled to respect as we ourselves are? They are members of the same Church for the most part. They are not different from ourselves. They are not the bad world we sometimes speak of. They are the Christian world that hears what is said, and it is right that they should hear what is said. I want to disabuse the minds of those who have heard this debate, for one would suppose that the galleries were filled with bad people, and that we must speak in whispers, and not let them hear us. Sir, they are as good as we are. They are as much interested in the affairs of the Church as we are. We have been elected to come here and legislate, but there are others looking on upon our proceedings just as worthy as we are, just as wise as we are, just as competent to judge as we are, and just as careful of what they shall say of our doings here, and of our speeches here, as we shall be. It is therefore I say you cannot accomplish the object which you have in view in closing your doors. But suppose it be expedient to do so; suppose a case may arise at any time when it would be best, wisest, and most prudent to close the doors, can we not do it? Are we forbidden to sit with closed doors under the old rule? Certainly not. We have sat in some cases with closed doors. I hope the old rule will stand.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin, obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem*. The hour has arrived for the recess, and the House takes a recess for one half-hour.

After half an hour's recess the House resumed its session.

RECEPTION OF FOREIGN VISITORS.

The PRESIDENT. This is the hour fixed for the reception.

The Committee appointed to present the Rt. Rev. George Augustus Selwyn, D.D. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield; the Rt. Rev. Ashton Oxenden, D.D., Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada; the Rt. Rev. James William Williams, D.D., Bishop of Quebec; and the other English and Colonial clergy in attendance on the Convention, appeared with the distinguished visitors, who were escorted to the platform and received by the President.

The Deputies rose to receive the distinguished visitors, and remained standing till they retired.

The PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the House of Deputies, I have the exceeding gratification of introducing to you once again the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, whose name is dear and familiar beyond the bounds of Christendom as well as within them, and is now especially dear to all American Churchmen.

The LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD (who was greeted with great applause). My dear brethren, it was my wish that you should allow the Province of Montreal, Canada, to address you first, for the very natural reason that the Metropolitan of Canada brings an address from a whole province of our Church, while I regret to say that I only present addresses from my own diocese. Feelings of delicacy would have prevented me from taking any precedence over so large a body of our fellow-churchmen as the bishops and clerical and lay representatives of the Province of Canada, but your President has ruled otherwise, for reasons which I have no doubt are good in his own mind, and therefore I proceed at once to present to you

the addresses which have been drawn up by the archdeacons and rural deans in my Diocese of Lichfield, with the assurance, that you may perhaps think unnecessary, that every word which I shall now read to you represents the very cordial feeling of those who have attached their names to these memorials. The first is a memorial from the Archdeacon and Rural Deans of the Archdeaconry of Stafford, which I will read:

"The Archdeacon and Rural Deans of the Archdeaconry of Stafford to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Lichfield:"

"MY LORD—We cannot allow your Lordship to leave the diocese for the purpose of being present at the Provincial Synod of the Church of Canada, and at the Convention of the bishops and clergy of the United States of America, without assuring you of our earnest desire that you may, by the blessing of God, have not only a prosperous voyage and safe return, but the fullest measure of comfort and benefit from your communion with Churches so intimately connected with our own by common origin and unity of doctrine and discipline.

"We further beg your Lordship to convey to those Churches our brotherly greeting, and the assurance of our sincere desire and prayer that they and the Church of this land may, in Christian love and zeal, promote the glory of God and the good of mankind.

"We would add how much satisfaction we shall have in offering a loving and hospitable welcome to any members of those Churches who may attend the Conference in England, which, we understand, it is one great object of your Lordship's visit to promote.

(Signed)

H. MOORE, Archdeacon of Stafford.

LOVELACE STAMER, R.D., of Stoke-on-Trent.

GEORGE MATHER, R.D., of Cheadle.

H. SUTCLIFFE, R.D., of Newcastle.

J. FINCK SMITH, M.A., R.D., of Walsall.

F. H. ILES, M.A., Rural Dean, of Wolverhampton.

F. S. BOLTON, B.D., Rural Dean, of Stafford.

WILLIAM J. HALL, M.A., Rural Dean, of Trysull.

ADELBERT J. R. ANSON, R.D., of Himley.

J. W. MARSHALL, R.D., of Handsworth.

T. R. O. BRIDGEMAN, R.D., of Brewood.

C. P. GOOD, R.D., of Eccleshall.

A. F. BOUCHER, R.D., of Leek.

T. A. BANGHAM, R.D., of Lichfield.

C. P. WILBRAHAM, R.D., of Penkridge.

R. M. GRIER, R.D., of Rugeley.

A. BROWNE, R.D., of Tamworth.

E. J. EDWARDS, R.D., of Trentham.

N. J. PEACH, R.D., of Tutbury.

W. HUTCHINSON, R.D., of Uttoxeter."

Of these names, many here will remember Mr. Iles and Mr. Bangham and Mr. Edwards, who were with me at your last General Convention, and the latter of whom is here now.

The second address which I have the honor to present is from the Archdeaconry of Derby:

"LICHFIELD, July 23, 1874.

"To our Brother Churchmen in Canada and the United States:"

"We, the undersigned, Rural Deans of Derbyshire, in the Diocese of Lichfield, desire to convey through the Right Rev. George Augustus, Lord Bishop of Lichfield, on the occasion of his visit to the Church in Canada and the United States of America, the expression of our true sympathy and fellowship with them as brethren in Christ.

EDWARD BALSTON, D.D., Archdeacon of Derby and Rural Dean of Bakewell.

EDWARD HENRY ABERNY, B.A., Prebendary of Lichfield and Rural Dean of Derby.

R. M. JONES, M.A., Vicar of Cromford and Rural Dean of Ashover.
 GEORGE HULL, B.A., Vicar of Chapel Entsforth and Rural Dean of Castleton.
 AUGUSTUS ADAM BAGSHAW, M.A., Cantab., Vicar of Wormhill and Rural Dean of Buxton.
 HENRY JAMES FEILDEN, Rector of Kirk Langley and Rural Dean of Radborne.
 SAMUEL ANDREW, Vicar of Tideswell and Rural Dean of Eyam.
 G. VERNON MELLOR, Vicar of Jaridgehay and Rural Dean of Wirthworth.
 T. A. ANSON, R.D., of Cabley.
 J. D. MACFARLAINE, R.D., of Stavcley.
 J. K. MARSH, Vicar and Rural Dean of Brampton.
 N. H. DEACON, Vicar and Rural Dean of Alfreton.
 G. ARTHUR FESTING, M.A., Vicar of Clifton and Rural Dean of Ashburne.
 MARISCHAL K. S. FRITH, M.A., Vicar of Allertree and Rural Dean of Duffield.
 JAMES THOMAS ALDERSON, Rector of Ravenstone, Rural Dean of Hartshorne.
 F. C. FISHER, Rector of Walton-on-Trent, Rural Dean of Lullington."

The third address which I beg to present is from the Archdeaconry of Shropshire. It is signed by all the rural Deans of the Archdeaconry of Salop, in the Diocese of Lichfield, nine in number, viz.: the Vicar of Gt. Ness, the Rector of Middle, the Rector of Donington, the Minister of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury, the Rector of Hodnet, the Vicar of Wellington, the Rector of Edmond, the Rector of Cressage, the Rector of Whitechurch, J. A.

"LICHFIELD, July 31, 1874.

"We, the undersigned, Archdeacon and Rural Deans of Salop in the Diocese of Lichfield, grateful to God for the fatherly loving-kindness and wise oversight of our Reverend Missionary Bishop, and humbly desiring that the Divine Spirit may bless his unceasing labors for the brotherly intercommunion of the Churches of Christ, desire to send affectionate greeting to the Bishops and pastors of the Church on the other side of the Atlantic, by the mouth and hands of our Diocesan.

"JOHN ALLEN, B. BANNING,
 C. D. KENYON, C. F. C. PIGOTT,
 G. H. EGERTON, FREDERICK BURD,
 H. G. DE BUNSEN, W. H. EGERTON."
 THOMAS B. LLOYD.

I have the greatest pleasure, my dear brethren, in presenting these addresses to you, the more so because this is the second time when I have had the opportunity, by God's providence, of placing before you these expressions of brotherly sympathy and love from the Church on the other side of the water. I am sure if I had been able to procure the same kind expressions of opinion from the more distant Churches with which I was formerly connected, the Churches in Australasia and New Zealand, they would all have been to the same tenor, for I am convinced of this, that throughout the now widespread limits of our Anglican Communion, there is, at the present moment, one prevailing feeling of brotherly love and Christian harmony and concord, with earnest prayer offered up from all the branches of our Church that it may please God to extend that feeling more and more, day by day, and unite us evermore, day by day, in the bond of peace and in brotherly love.

This is all that I have at this present moment to say to you, except to remind you of one most interesting occasion which has occurred since I met you last, and that was the presentation of the alms-basin, which was furnished in the city of Baltimore as a memorial of the visit of the English Deputation to the General Convention in that city in the year

1871. It was my happiness to present that alms-basin to the Archbishop of Canterbury in concert with one whose loss we all lament, who is now with God in his rest, Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, who, hand in hand with me, each of us holding the alms-basin by one hand and on bended knee, presented that alms-basin for the Lord's table in St. Paul's Cathedral, on the 4th of July. On that occasion, I thought I could not do better than to send by the electric telegraph to Bishop Potter, the Bishop of the Diocese of New York, a telegram containing these few words, limited, of course, to the smallest possible range on account of the cost of the mode of conveyance, but expressing, therefore, so much more the concentrated feelings of our hearts. The words were these:

"*Bishop Selwyn to Bishop Potter:*

"Alms-basin presented in St. Paul's Cathedral, 4th of July. Independence is not disunion." [Applause.]

If, my dear brethren, you should desire to take up one thought of a practical kind which occurs in these addresses, it is perfectly true that I have come in the earnest hope that my presence here, and that of my dear brother, the Metropolitan of Canada, may tend to bring to a point the question now being mooted in England, of the repetition of the Lambeth Conference of 1867, which I believe in my conscience and in my heart to have been the very greatest event that has happened for the benefit of our Protestant Episcopal Church since the time of the Reformation. If you should be pleased to take up that question and express any opinion upon it, I am sure it would give great gratification to all those in England who desire on every possible ground, social, brotherly, public, that the Bishops of all the various branches of our great Anglican Communion should meet again on English soil, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to consult for the good of our whole Church, for the extension of its work throughout the world, for the appeasing of all strife among ourselves, and so for furthering all those purposes which our Divine Lord has given us to do, and to aid us in which He sent down from heaven His blessed Spirit.

I have nothing more to say on the present occasion but to assure you of my own unabated feeling of brotherly love towards you all, and to hope that my visit here again with my dear friend Mr. Edwards, who comes a second time for that purpose, may not be altogether unproductive of beneficial results. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. I have now the pleasure of introducing to you the Most Rev. Lord Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada.

The LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL. My Brethren and Mr. President, I beg leave to say that it is to me a matter of very deep interest and of heartfelt joy that I have been permitted to attend the meeting of this grand and great Convention. When I first arrived in the city of New York on Tuesday evening, I confess to a feeling of loneliness in entering your great and gorgeous city; but that feeling of solitariness left me as soon as I entered the vast and noble congregation that met me in this chapel on the following morning. I then felt that I was among beloved brethren, brethren of a sister Church, and may I not say almost brethren of the same Church as my own, for these two Churches, the Church of England in Canada and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, are in point of fact almost identical. Their outward form is nearly similar. We hold together the same great and glorious and precious definite truths, and we worship together under the same blessed forms which we both look upon as our mutual inheritance. We of the Church of Canada, I can assure you, look with

great admiration upon your Church, because of its Constitution, which I believe is as perfect and symmetrical as human minds can devise. That Constitution, we remember, was formed some eighty years ago, and it has served as a sort of model upon which have been since founded the various forms of Church Constitution in our Colonies. Truly, I may say so as regards the Church of Canada, the Church in New Zealand, and the Church in Australia.

Then we also admire your Church for its onward progress, for its determination, in God's strength, to go forward and continually make an aggressive movement in this, its land. We remember that some three-quarters of a century ago there was but one diocese of the Episcopal Protestant Church in this land, and now that Episcopate has been multiplied fifty-fold. We earnestly desire to copy your zeal in that respect, and to be a progressive and an advancing Church, an aggressive Church.

But we admire, most of all, your zeal and earnestness and devotedness in uplifting the cross of Christ and bringing sinners to the common Saviour; and it is for this reason that, at a late meeting of the Provincial Synod of Canada, of which I have the great honor to be the President, an address was agreed on to be presented to this Convention. I was charged with that address in common with my friend and brother, our Prolocutor; and although I have conceded to him the honor and privilege of presenting that address to you—having already presented it myself to the Upper House—I still feel that I stand here in a somewhat public capacity, as representing the Church of England in Canada.

And now, my Christian friends and brethren, I desire to thank you for having listened to me; I desire to thank you for having admitted me to-day into your House; and I desire earnestly to pray that it may please God to pour out upon you largely, in your deliberations at this time, towards which the eye of the Church is directed, the spirit of wisdom, forbearance, Christian gentleness and union, and of Christian and spiritual holiness. I trust that this meeting of the Convention may be the means, under Him, of promoting His glory, and of advancing the great interests of the Church in this land. [Applause.]

THE PRESIDENT. I next present the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Kingston.

THE LORD BISHOP OF KINGSTON. My friends, I come among you to-day in a position which I scarcely wish to occupy in one respect, representing only myself. I am the Bishop of a small Island, not measuring more than a hundred and forty miles in length, not including in it more than about half a million inhabitants, and in which I have not the oversight of more than about one hundred church-stations; but I have come here simply upon the invitation of a single individual Bishop of your own Church, with whom I have had the honor of forming a warm friendship and attachment, and I have been able to reconcile with other arrangements visiting New York just at the time of all others at which I should naturally desire to do so. In truth, I feel myself almost overwhelmed already by the warmth and kindness of the reception which I have personally experienced. I sincerely say that I could wish for no better spirit to prevail in any branch of the Church of Christ, with which I have ever been acquainted, than that which seems to me to be existing here, at least among those with whom I have had the pleasure of meeting. It is true, as yet, I have to make the acquaintance, I hope, of a good many more of the presbyters of this Church. In the upper House I have been almost overwhelmed with kindness, and this, I must say, I think to be no light matter. Truly it is the mutual love which

we, as fellow-workers with the Lord Jesus Christ, have one to another. It is to this we are to look to overcome all differences that may still subsist between us, and cement us yet more closely into a more perfect organization. Still, whatsoever is wanting in the completing of our machinery for carrying out the same purpose for which we are associated, even here, I find, in the United States, your Church has not attained an absolute perfection of organization. You are occupying your time still with questions of great importance in rendering that organization, in your own judgment, more perfect; and you are invited to debate, you have been just invited to debate to-day, by my Right Reverend Brother, the Bishop of Lichfield, whether you cannot do more to cement your union with all the other branches of the Anglican Church, by meeting in conference in another land, or it might be, by-and-by, perhaps, here also. But what is the foundation of all this but that love of a common Christianity which we share?

I wish I could, upon this occasion, assure you that I am speaking the sentiments of the Clergy of my own Diocese. They were not aware of my intention to come here, nor was I myself, at the time of the meeting of our last Synod. I may, however, be permitted to say that, having been one of a large number of Bishops assembled from different parts of the West Indies in conference the other day, we united in praying the Archbishop of Canterbury ere long to take such steps as would effect the meeting of another conference at Lambeth. Mainly for this reason, let me assure you that we all have felt that our union with the other branches of the Church cannot be complete so long as only the Church of England and the Church of the Colonies immediately connected with England are affected. We need your presence, your sympathy, your co-operation, too. We did not see how we could be linked on to all branches of this great Church, to which we are dearly attached, unless you joined with us. And I would earnestly pray that the time may come when such meetings as this at which I have the pleasure of being present may be seen to be but the anticipation of a time yet to come, when the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity of the great Church of this land, and the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity of other branches of the same, shall meet together in conference, and exchange brotherly greetings with mutual prayers for God's blessing on each other, such as that in which I have the happiness of taking my humble part now. [Great applause.]

THE PRESIDENT. I now present to you the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Quebec.

THE LORD BISHOP OF QUEBEC. Mr. President and my very dear Brethren: After what has been said by our Metropolitan, who speaks by right of place for the Canadian Church, and whose name lends the weight of personal esteem and of a character well and widely known to the authority of his office, I should not have ventured to obtrude myself upon this Convention. Since, however, your courtesy makes occasion for me to introduce myself with my own voice to those whose acquaintance I have come so far to make, I avail myself gladly of the permission to tell you, in few words, how much my spirit rejoices to join with you in the communion of worship and of counsel which belongs to the brotherhood of Christ, to tell you with what a thrill of joy in the warmth of your fellowship I feel my heart throb with the common pulsation of the one body wherein we are all members one of another. Our presence here to-day is, and is intended to be, a token and a testimony of our respect for the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and those of us who are deputed by the Provincial

Synod of Canada are charged further to consult with you in such manner as to you shall seem expedient for the furtherance of a still closer union between these two branches of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, yours and ours.

I must confess that, although I had willingly for the reasons I have indicated undertaken to form one of this deputation, this latter part of our office seems to me a little superfluous, for though there may be, for all I know, certain accidents and details of intercommunion admitting of smoother adjustment, yet the substance of the unity in the one body and the one spirit I am right sure now we have. Freely at the Lord's table, without let or hindrance, the brethren intermingle; freely the clergy pass to and fro and minister in the cure of souls. Of the closeness, the completeness of the organic unity of this connection, I am in my own person a living witness, for when I was called and commissioned to be a Bishop in the Church of Canada, upon my head was laid the honored hand of him who was of late the presiding Bishop of the American Church.

We are here, my very dear friends, as witnesses to manifest a unity which does exist; we are, some of us, to consult, if need be, for drawing yet closer the bonds of that unity in all cases. The unity of the Spirit we endeavor to keep, and I am persuaded shall keep, in the bonds of peace. [Applause.]

THE PRESIDENT. We have present with us, I am happy to say, and I beg to introduce to you, the Lord Bishop—I should say, the late Missionary Bishop—of Zanzibar.

BISHOP TOZER. I am very glad to say that I have a point of agreement which none of my brethren from abroad have with you in the United States, from my never having been a Lord Bishop, and I am very glad that I am so far a republican that that title could never legitimately and truly appertain to me. [Laughter.]

At this late period of the proceedings I cannot detain you by a speech. There are many standing before me who have been standing a long time, and I am sure at a very great inconvenience; and it would be less than human to say that one was exceedingly interested in the sight before one, that one was exceedingly interested in the proceedings of this Convention, and that one was hopeful that they would issue in the greater solidity of the Church and the greater charity exhibited by one member towards another.

I have nothing more to say than that I thank you extremely for the kind way in which you have allowed me to appear before you this morning.

THE PRESIDENT. I next present Reverend Dr. Geddes, Prolocutor of the Church of Canada.

Rev. Dr. GEDDES. Mr. President, Reverend Brethren, and Brethren of the Laity: I appear before you in an official capacity. The Most Reverend the Metropolitan of Canada has already informed you that we come bearers of a message of Christian love and warm affection from the Church in Canada to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as represented in your august and venerable body. I shall first of all read that address, and then, with the permission of your President, I shall venture to offer a few observations:

"To the Right Reverend the Bishops, and the Clerical and Lay Representatives, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States:

"The Provincial Synod of Canada, now in session, desires to send its very hearty and fraternal greeting to the Right Reverend the Bishops, and the Clerical and Lay Deputies, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and earnestly prays that their approaching General Convention may be so blessed by Almighty God, that by their means His truth may be established, and His king-

dom advanced, through the length and breadth of the United States.

(Signed)

A. MONTREAL,

President.

J. GAMBLE GEDDES,

Prolocutor.

CHARLES HAMILTON, M.A.,

Clerical Sec'y Prov. Synod.

F. MACKENZIE,

Lay Secretary.

MONTREAL, 11th September, 1874."

I need scarcely say that the address you have just heard, necessarily short, expresses very inadequately the warm and earnest and hearty interest felt by the Church in Canada in the prosperity of the Church in the United States. We, as Canadian Churchmen, have with feelings of admiration and gratitude, I may say, to Almighty God, seen the mighty growth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this great and growing country. We recall the struggles she had to make, and manfully did she make them, during the earlier period of her history, when, holding the vital principle of the Primitive Church, *sine episcopo nulla ecclesia*, she was yet deprived of the Episcopacy, and was obliged for a long time to spend her strength in loneliness and discouragement. "Her vineyard the wild boar of the wood appeared to be rooting up; her hedges were broken down, and everybody that passed by plucked off her grapes." This was her sad and lonely condition then, and now what do we behold? A church with her nearly threescore Bishops, her three thousand Clergy, Priests, and Deacons, her noble body of loyal and devoted Laymen, and her tens and hundreds of thousands of communicants—a mighty and a powerful host combined to carry forward the standard of the cross, "fair and beauteous as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners." We look at the records of her history, and see the catalogue of those great and holy men whose memories shed a lustre upon the page of her history, commencing with the dauntless Seabury, the Father of the American Episcopate, the memorable White, the noble-hearted Hobart, the accomplished Hopkins, the eloquent Doane, the courtly Wainwright and Delancey, the saintly and venerable Bishop of Ohio, Mellvaine, the good and learned and legal minded Whitehouse, men who by their learning and their zeal and their piety would adorn the Episcopal Bench of any Church in Christendom. [Applause.] When we survey these things we feel proud of your achievements as a Church. We feel proud of our relationship to you, the younger sister, the two sisters, daughters of the beloved, venerable, and venerated mother, the dear old Church of England. [Great applause.]

Engaged, then, in the same holy work with yourself, having the same anxieties and encouragements, the same hopes and fears, we come here to ask your sympathy and your prayers; and we come to offer you in return our poor prayers and our heartfelt and warmest sympathy.

In the name of the venerable Archdeacons and the reverend clergy who form a deputation with me, in the name, I may say, of the whole Church in Canada—for the Metropolitan will authorize me, I trust, to say so—we bid you God-speed in your great and holy work. We say to you in the language of the Psalmist, "The Lord prosper you;" we wish you good luck in the name of the Lord. [Applause.]

THE PRESIDENT. The venerable Archdeacon Fuller I now present.

Archdeacon FULLER. I had not expected to have the honor of being presented to this body this afternoon, but it being urged upon me by my dear

old friend Dr. Shelton, I could not resist the privilege of addressing you a few words.

I desire, on behalf of the Church of England in Canada and in all the Colonies of Great Britain, to thank you, the members of the Church in the United States, for the privileges that we enjoy as having Synods in every colony of the British Empire. It is a curious fact that in 1836—so long ago as that—I ventured, though then a very young man, to write a pamphlet on the question of the Canadian Church. It was entitled "Thoughts on the Present Condition and Future Prospects of the Church of England in Canada." I depicted our then condition, a weak and feeble body, entirely dependent upon the great Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which had the privilege under God of planting the Church in this very country. I say we were then dependent upon this Society for the support of all our clergy. I saw that this could not long last; I saw that we should soon be thrown on our own resources, and I asked myself the question, How shall we be able to meet our wants when that day arrives? I looked, my dear friends, to the Church in this country. I saw that you had gone through the same process. I saw that the steps that you had taken were blessed by Almighty God to the building up of the Church in this land, and I felt that we could do no better than follow your example. I therefore suggested that we should call the laity into the councils of our Church. Our late venerated and able Bishop, Dr. Strong, took the matter up and threw it into a practical form, and in 1853 we had, in the Diocese of Toronto, the first Synod of the United Church of England in the whole world, and now, thank God, Synods are to be held in every colony in the British Empire; and we owe it all to you, under God, that such is the case.

I desire also to have an opportunity of expressing, on behalf of the Church of England in Canada, our deep obligation for the social relations in which we have been placed for a great many years. I had long the privilege of being a neighbor of one who stands well, one who is venerated by all this assembly, the Rector of St. Paul's Church, Buffalo. He has done more than any other man that I know of, to bind closely together the kindest feelings between the Canadian Church and the Church of this country. [Applause.] And I thank God that this is the case.

These are the only things that I deem it necessary to address to you on this occasion, except to say that I agree most fully with my friend, the Prolocutor, in all he has said in regard to our earnest desire that God's richest and best blessings may rest on you. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. In the Venerable Archdeacon Balch you will recognize an old friend, who, I believe, will be glad in his present condition to exchange greetings with the members of the Church to which he so lately belonged.

Archdeacon BALCH. Mr. President, it would not be good taste for me to occupy many moments of your time, reverend and dear brethren; but I feel constrained, as a sense of duty to the dead, to say one word. I am persuaded that no heart in this large congregation and this vast representative assembly from every part of the wide domain of the great Republic but has felt quickened in its impulse of sympathy and enlarged in its spirit of charity by what has already preceded. It was my privilege and honor to introduce into the Provincial Synod the resolution which has resulted in the presence of this delegation to-day; but I am not entitled to the credit of inaugurating and bringing to a certain degree of success the

great work of making these two sisters as one. That belongs to the wise and the great Bishop Fulford, the first Metropolitan of Canada. Several years ago he moved her Majesty's Secretary for the Colonies, the late Duke of Newcastle, to introduce and have passed through the Imperial Parliament an enabling-act, whereby the Parliament of Canada could remove all legal disabilities to the residence of American clergymen within the bounds of the Church in British North America, and he saw that act consummated, and himself gave expression to the delight which he derived from it at the Convention of 1865 when he addressed this body; and in the providence of God it happened that I was the first American clergyman called under that new state of things to hold an official position in Canada; and I am only in some humble degree endeavoring to carry out that work which he so wisely and so successfully inaugurated. And, beloved brethren, if any man could have the spirit of prophecy and lift up his eyes to the time when Asia and Europe, crossing the Continent, must fasten their eyes upon the free thought, free speech, free press, and the unfettered Church of this continent, is it not within the bounds of more than probability that the free institutions and the Church regulations of this country are ultimately to be the means under God of vastly extending and increasing the knowledge of Christ? When we reflect that from Maine to Florida that venerable and noble Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts have shown their sense of stewardship to this continent, and when we reflect that the gift of an English Queen has enabled a noble corporation to dispense on such a grand scale the charities of the Church in this diocese, surely when a delegation from a large portion of another English Queen's dominions are present to give assurances of sympathy and regard, we are not surprised at the earnest welcome, the hearty, cordial greeting, with which they have been received.

On behalf of my reverend brethren of this delegation, I shall close these few remarks by saying that our gratification and happiness on this occasion can only be excelled when in the providence of God we can welcome a similar delegation on the floor of the Provincial Synod. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. I now present to you the Rev. Mr. Edwards, of Trentham, England.

Rev. Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, friends of the Clergy and Laity, in this Synod assembled: I trust I shall not be considered to be indulging my own personal feelings too far if I say that I have never adverted in conversation or thought to any day so bright and so eventful in a life so uneventful as that of a country clergyman in the diocese of Lichfield, as that day when I was allowed by the kindness of the Bishop of Lichfield and through your permission to address you a few words in Emmanuel Church in Baltimore. Little did I deem that that great privilege would be accorded to me a second time. I am conscious that such a bright sunny day cast a gleam across the broad Church-path, gave me a sense of the glorious brotherhood of the Christian Church which I had never felt before, which I still feel, and which I trust I shall feel to my last hour. [Applause.]

No one can have the pleasure of travelling in your Western States, and breathing the quickening air of a distant diocese like Nebraska, without feeling his frame invigorated by breathing the air that comes across those wild plains; and it is no less intelligible that, "cribbed, cabined, and confined," as possibly the mind may become in the parochial routine of a country parish, it may feel a wholesome enlargement when it finds itself in the presence of so many with whom one is permitted in some sense to labor

in the same cause as he may be attempting to do on the other side of the Atlantic.

What one feels more and more is the necessity for increased personal intercourse. Letters are very well; addresses are also very well; but we need to see each other face to face, if we are to believe one another, and to acquire confidence in one another, which is only, I think, to be had through getting acquainted with our fellow-men, and learning their difficulties and imparting our own to them. We want something of that spirit which animates the comrades of a regiment who have toiled together in the long campaign, and then know that they may trust to the backing of their friends when the day of conflict arrives. [Applause.]

I earnestly hope that we may take advantage more and more of the facilities for personal intercourse, which surely belong to the Church as well as to the purposes of trade, and that we may be brought together more and more than hitherto on your side and on our own, that we may understand of what metal we are made on either side; and I trust that should this expected Lambeth Conference draw any of those whom I see before me to-day to our shore, my cup will be filled to the brim in the satisfaction of seeing you not only in England, but, as I trust, in our own Diocese, possibly under the roof of a country clergyman. [Applause.]

Before I release you from that position which a Bishop some time ago felt it was a pain to him to witness—and how much more, therefore, must a Presbyterian feel the like difficulty?—may I say on behalf of those of my brethren of the clergy who accompanied the Bishop of Lichfield in 1871, that they greatly would have enjoyed a repetition of their visit, as I most certainly have done, but the duties of a parish and the cares of home throw things of one kind or another in their way. One of them, as you know, is—I will not say in a penal settlement [laughter], and yet it was a penal settlement, but he is at Norfolk Island, carrying on the great work originated by his father [applause], and now being carried on with all that truth and energy that belong to a young man, still in the prime of life, devoting his first and best energies to the service of his Lord, and following in the steps of his great father. [Applause.]

I beg most respectfully to apologize for the detention which I have been guilty of, and to thank you once more.

The PRESIDENT then presented successively the other members of the Canadian delegation, and the clergymen accompanying the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, who had not spoken, and all having been presented the distinguished visitors were escorted from the platform to the body of the hall.

INTERCOMMUNION WITH CANADA.

The following message (No. 4) was received from the House of Bishops:

"Whereas, A Joint Committee was appointed by the late Provincial Synod of the Dominion of Canada, held at Montreal, consisting of the Most Reverend the Metropolitan, and the Lord Bishop of Quebec, together with the Prolocutor, Rev. J. Gamble Geddes, Rev. Henry Roe, of Quebec, C. J. Brydges, Esq., of Montreal, Archdeacon Fuller, of Toronto, Chancellor Henderson, of Ontario, Archdeacon Balch, of Huron, Rev. Canon Ketchum, of Fredericton, Hon. C. P. Hill, of Nova Scotia, to confer with some similar Committee of the Church in the United States on the best measures to promote intercommunion and fellowship between the sister Churches; therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That a joint committee, consisting of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen,

be appointed to confer with this joint committee of the Provincial Synod of Canada, and if practicable, to report to this Convention."

And it has appointed as the joint committee on the part of the House, the Bishops of Long Island, Ohio, and Western New York.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that this House concur, and that the Chair appoint the Joint Committee on the part of the House.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut; Rev. Dr. Rudder, of Pennsylvania; Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Massachusetts; Mr. Fish, of New York; Mr. Ruggles, of New York; and Mr. Meads, of Albany, the Committee on the part of the House of Deputies.

REPORT ON MISSIONARY BISHOPS' FUND.

The PRESIDENT. We are about to introduce a matter very appropriate to the exercises in which we have just been engaged, the report of the Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund. I am not willing that we should enter upon the order of the day, because that might pass over the time when it would be possible to offer this report. I am told by the gentleman who has it in charge that it is obliged to be offered on this second day of the session. I will ask the consent of the House, therefore, to have the report presented. It requires no action.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I move that we postpone the order of the day for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT. By general consent that may be done. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret that the Chair made some remarks in regard to this report, because they are calculated to create a false impression in reference to the matter of which the report treats. I regret to say it is not in the power of the Trustees of this fund to make a favorable report at all. Therefore, it was a cause of regret that I heard the President say that this was an appropriate occasion to make the report. The facts are that thus far the Canon to provide a competent fund for the support of the Missionary Episcopate is not a practicable Canon, and therefore it has not brought forth any practical fruits; but I trust that the importance of the subject of which this Canon treats will hereafter cause it to be taken up, and so amended as to make it practicable in providing a fund for this great, increasing, and important object. With these few preliminary remarks I will read the report of the Trustees:

"The undersigned, Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund, beg leave respectfully to report:

"That in conformity with the duties devolving upon them under the Canon, they prepared an 'Appeal' to the Church at large for contributions to the fund, a copy of which is hereto annexed, and that they caused the same to be published in the Church papers as generally and as long as they found it practicable to do so without expense. The result, however, has been far from satisfactory, as but very few persons responded to the call. The names of those who did so will be found in the Treasurer's account, hereto annexed, the total amount of donations having been \$256, which, with interest to the present time, now amounts to the sum of \$298 81.

"It is quite evident to the Trustees that, if a permanent fund is ever to be established for the Missionary Episcopate, some legislation by the Convention will be necessary to make the Canon on that subject more practical and effective.

"It is made the duty of the Board of Missions, through its committees, to pay over to the Trustees all sums received by them for the purposes designated in this Canon; but as nothing has been received from these committees, the Trustees presume that no sum has been thus specifically given, and that the

committees have had to use all their energies and influence in the parishes in order to provide for the present support of the missionary bishops, so that they could not give attention toward soliciting for a permanent fund.

"The parishes constitute the proper field in which to labor for replenishing the treasury of the Church, and the rectors, the officers to whom we must look to inculcate in their people a proper appreciation of the Church's need of money, as well as of their duty to supply it through those channels which the General Council of the Church commends to their support. It is evident that the parishes or rectors do not recognize that any obligation is imposed upon them by this canon, for there has been but one contribution (\$5) from a clergyman since the last Convention.

"The Trustees respectfully submit to the General Convention whether the Canon shall be so amended as to require an annual collection in each parish for this object.

"The Missionary Episcopate is rapidly extending, and the question of its support is assuming serious importance. Without some systematic provision to secure funds, the present Canon seems to the Trustees to be practically useless.

"All of which is respectfully submitted,
CAMBRIDGE LIVINGSTON,
HENRY MEIGS,
WM. H. BATTLE,
L. N. WHITTLE,

Trustees.

NEW YORK, October 7, 1874."

RULES OF ORDER.

The PRESIDENT. The regular order is now before the House, being the 17th proposed rule, and the question is on the amendment of the Deputy from Wisconsin (Mr. Adams).

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I do not intend to make any speech otherwise than I have spoken before. I will repeat what I said before, and before I utter those few sentences I will, at the suggestion of a distinguished friend, request that I have the liberty of changing my amendment from "necessitating discussion of" to "involving consideration of." I suppose I am at liberty to do so.

I will not undertake the discussion of what gentlemen have said on this floor in reference to what I yesterday said, but I will say this much, that with regard to any bishop that comes before us for our signatures—as we have to sign the testimonials—we have the right to the most full discussion of every personal qualification he has or has not for the episcopate.

It has been said by my colleague on this floor, the clerical gentleman from Wisconsin, who spoke twice this morning, that there were two matters with regard to which this House could testify—error in religion and viciousness of life. I have looked at the form, and I find that we are to testify to these two facts: that he "is not justly liable to evil report for error in religion or for viciousness of life, and that we do not know or believe there is any impediment on account of which he ought not to be consecrated to that holy office." That is to say, we go into the whole question of canonical impediments to consecration. How extensive that question is, every one who has examined the subject of ordination or consecration to the Episcopate knows. It involves, I believe, nine or ten distinct canonical impediments. That is a little more than my distinguished friend from Wisconsin thought we were to testify to. And then, in order to finish up the enumeration, we ourselves are to testify to his piety, sobriety, and honesty; that is to say, we are to give our testimonials in addition to all this, that he is pious, that he is sober, that he is

honest, "that he has led his life, as we believe, for three years last past piously, soberly, and honestly." Therefore, Mr. President, this House and every member of this House, has to come forward and testify to the most complete list of canonical, moral, and religious qualifications in reference to a candidate for the episcopate. From this very fact we ought to have the privilege of having brought before us, fully and distinctly by any person on the floor of this House, everything whatsoever that is connected with that large range of qualifications.

Now, Mr. President, to give an instance, here is one gentleman from the Diocese of Georgia who has brought up an instance which he knows personally of a clergyman who years ago committed a great crime; undoubtedly he has repented of it, and yet that gentleman would be fully authorized to bring up that crime as an impediment under the laws of the Church, and by our present arrangements he would have to do it before all the multitude.

Again: there are small matters, which small matters are implied in the words "piously, soberly, and honestly." I could instance a clergyman who undoubtedly was one of the ablest men of the Church, a man of distinguished talents and distinguished eloquence, and yet that man had so much of the spirit of jest and joke about him as would in the opinion of every man of his acquaintance disqualify him for the Episcopate. If he were alive now and were to come up before this House, do you think that I or any other gentleman in this House would feel that before the representatives of the press, before a miscellaneous congregation here, we should come out and say that the spirit of joking and jesting was not convenient, and make ourselves liable to be reprimanded in the press for that? I have heard also of clergy in former times who were not very sober, of some who perhaps had been too desirous of the world's fruits. The most appropriate and most suitable manner of presenting such matters would be after shutting out all but ourselves. Having done that, we can go into a discussion of all those matters of personal character which may be impediments which we can speak plainly before our brethren of the clergy and laity, but which we do not want to speak before a mixed multitude, much less before the representatives of the press. The personal defects which disqualify canonically a man for the episcopate I would not bring up in the presence of many persons. Why would I not bring them up? Simply for the reason, I will say to this assembly of clergymen and laymen, that during the last twenty years there has taken place in the press of these United States the greatest deterioration capable of existing. I say that the sensational daily press of these United States should be shut out from all discussions involving personal qualifications or disqualifications for any office in the ministry, and I say so because it has been my own experience, and I believe is the experience of every man in the United States that has read any report in the sensational daily papers of any Convention whatever, for an election to the Episcopate, that there is utter hatred against the Church and utter contempt for all holy things in the sensational daily press.

It is for that reason that I have brought forward this among the rules of order, and I believe there is not a clergyman or a layman in this Convention who will not understand and feel that there should be the fullest liberty for the discussion of the personal qualifications of any man who comes before us as a candidate to receive that testimonial which we have to give, and that we ought to protect any clergyman from the insults or abuse with which he is liable to be

trampled upon by that deteriorated press, the vilest press on the face of God's earth, the most infamous that the world, the flesh, or the devil ever could get up.

I beg leave now to withdraw my amendment in favor of Governor Stevenson's amendment.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Then I wish to propose an amendment which I think Governor Stevenson will accept, as it reduces the number of words and covers the ground. The only proposition I have to offer is :

"That whenever the election or confirmation of a bishop is under discussion, the House shall sit with closed doors."

It merely reduces the number of words in the rule. If Governor Stevenson will accept this, I will say, let it be his.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I accept it. ["Question." "Question."]

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. Mr. President—The PRESIDENT. If this question is to be further discussed, I must ask that some gentleman will move a postponement of the consideration of this 17th rule until to-morrow, to enable the House to pass the whole body of rules, with that exception, before we adjourn to-day. There are a number of committees to be appointed under these new rules, and the whole list of committees is waiting upon our action here to be printed. We should finish this matter to-night. ["Question." "Question."]

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Can we not pass the amendment of Mr. Stevenson as accepted?

The PRESIDENT. I think so; but the gentleman from Albany claims the floor.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. I will not detain the House long.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I move that after the gentleman from Albany closes his speech the vote be taken.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that at the end of the speech made by the Rev. Deputy from Albany the House shall take the question.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. It seems to me, Mr. President, that since the discussion of this question was commenced, the speeches have taken a range that has carried the attention of the House entirely away from the true issue. There are two sides to this question, and a good deal to be said truthfully on both sides. There are very grave difficulties attending a discussion of the character of a nominee sent to this House for the Episcopate of our Church; but I am fully persuaded that there are vastly graver difficulties that will arise if this Convention shall conclude, in this year 1874, to go back to a condition of things that was not tolerated eighty years ago, and veil its discussions and actions in secrecy from the public; I will not say from the world, because the Church is not gathered within the walls of this place where the General Convention holds its session. The Church is all over this land everywhere, and we are but its representatives, acting in its name and for its interest in everything we do. If it were practicable to establish a rule of absolute secrecy, the case would be different; but every man acquainted with public affairs knows that it is absolutely impossible to stop the leakage of such a body as this when an important question that agitates men's passions and their convictions of duty is under discussion. It would be a great deal better that the matter debated here should go out just as it occurred in the House, than that it should filter out through gossip and in whispers colored and distorted with suppressions and innuendoes that would make the whole case different, and embarrass the ac-

tion of the Church in the confirmation of nominees to the Episcopate infinitely beyond what that action has ever been embarrassed before.

Now, the truth is, Mr. President, that the most rigorous searching—close scrutiny—is had in the election in the Diocesan Convention. To be consistent, we ought to make a provision for secret sessions there, if anywhere; but there everything is open and in sight of the sun, as I believe, before heaven, it ought to be; that it is for the health of the Church that it ought to be; that it is for brotherly kindness and the spirit of charity that it ought to be.

It has been said that it is important for the protection of the nominee that the sessions should be secret. It seems to me this is not the case. Any gentleman who chooses to permit himself to be placed in the position of a nominee for the episcopate of the American Church, by so doing accepts all the conditions of scrutiny that attend the passage of his case through the General Convention in the House of Deputies; and I contend that it would attach a deeper and a darker stigma to the name and character of a clergyman rejected in this House who had been nominated to it for the episcopate of any diocese, where the session was secret and where as far as possible the grounds of his rejection were sealed under a veil of secrecy, than if the whole question was open before the Church and world, and he was rejected simply because in the judgment of this House, for various reasons that did not touch his moral, perhaps not his intellectual or clerical character, we had decided on our conscience before God that we thought him not a suitable person for the high office and holy work of the episcopate in our Church.

Again, there is one consideration that it seems to me we are to bear in mind, and it is this: That finally, after the Diocesan Convention has had an open scrutiny, after the General Convention has had an open scrutiny, though you should go back and veil the scrutiny from the world, there comes the most solemn period in the whole transaction. The nominee has been approved, his testimonials signed, the day appointed for his consecration, and all the circumstances and solemn exercises arranged, and finally at the supreme moment the consecrating Bishop, before the assembled thousands, challenges any one there: "Say whether there is anything known in relation to this person who, under God, is to assume the most solemn and sacred responsibilities that ever pressed upon a human soul—whether there is any reason why he should not be clothed with these solemn functions." Can that be veiled? Is not that an open scrutiny? Whatever the objection might be, though it were the grossest and gravest that could be conceived of, must be brought out there, or the consciences of those who know that objection must be defiled with so deep a defilement that it would be doubtful whether any earthly repentance and tears could wash it out.

It seems to me that the circumstances of the age in which we live should convince us that it is impossible if we would, that it is undesirable if we could, to try to gather around ourselves a veil of darkness, of secrecy, in any matter that is clearly to affect the interests of the Church. We cannot do it if we would. We ought not to do it if we could. There are evils, I grant you there may be great evils, connected with the present method; but they are evils more easily borne than the other evils into which we should rush if we undertook to establish a new rule in this latter part of the nineteenth century that was scarcely tolerable in the beginning of the same.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The argument of the gentleman is founded on a fabrication. There

is nothing in the service of Consecration of a Bishop calling on individuals. ["Question," "Question."]

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Stevenson) to the 17th Rule, so as to make the rule read :

"Whenever the election or confirmation of a bishop is under consideration, the House shall sit with closed doors."

The amendment was agreed to, there being on a division—ayes, 131 ; noes, 90.

The rule as amended was adopted.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I suggest that the session be continued until we get through the rules. It will take but a very few minutes after four o'clock.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Why cannot we have all the remaining rules acted on at once ? There is no question about the others.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the adoption of the remaining rules.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the remaining rules be adopted without reading. They are simply the old rules, and it is a mere matter of form.

The motion was agreed to ; and the remaining rules were adopted, as follows :

"18. All questions of order shall be decided by the Chair, without debate ; but any member may appeal from such decision ; and on such appeal, no member shall speak more than once, without express leave of the House.

"19. The names of the movers of resolutions shall appear upon the minutes of this House.

"20. Every member who shall be in the House when any question is put shall, on a division, be counted, unless he be personally interested in the discussion.

"21. While the President is putting any question, the members shall continue in their seats, and shall not hold any private discourse.

"22. When any member is about to speak, or deliver any matter to the House, he shall, with due respect, address himself to the President, confining himself strictly to the point in debate.

"23. No member shall speak more than twice in the same debate without leave of the House.

"24. All committees shall be appointed by the President, unless otherwise ordered.

"25. When the House is about to rise, every member shall keep his seat until the President leaves his chair, and before the President leaves the chair he may make any communication to the House, or cause any notice to be read by the Secretary.

"26. No member shall absent himself from the service of the House, unless he have leave or be unable to attend."

The PRESIDENT. The question is now on the adoption of all the rules as a whole.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I offer the following additional rule :

"When memorials or petitions are presented, their contents shall be concisely stated by the Deputy presenting them, and they shall be referred or laid on the table, unless by majority vote the memorial or petition shall be ordered to be read."

I shall not say anything because the necessity of this rule is so apparent. Any man who offers a petition or memorial can briefly state its contents, and then if the House desires it to be read it can be done so by a majority vote.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the proposed additional rule.

The rule was adopted.

Mr. FISH, of New York. I offer as an additional rule the following :

"No amendment to these rules shall be made unless one day's notice shall have been given of the

motion to amend ; and no rule shall be suspended unless by unanimous consent of the members present."

It is for the protection and conservation of the rules that I offer this.

Mr. JENKINS, of Georgia. Is that proposition susceptible of a division ?

The PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. JENKINS, of Georgia. I ask for a division.

Mr. FISH, of New York. It is suggested that I should say "two-thirds," instead of "unanimous consent." I would rather say "four-fifths."

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I propose instead of "unanimous consent" to say, "unless by the consent of two-thirds."

Mr. JENKINS, of Georgia. With that modification I withdraw the call for a division.

Mr. FISH, of New York. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the proposed additional rule.

The rule was adopted.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I move the adoption of the whole rules.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I have another rule to offer. I presume it will meet with no opposition.

"In the decision of all parliamentary questions not embraced in these rules of order, Cushing's Manual shall be authority."

The PRESIDENT. I suggest to the Deputy to withdraw that. It will give rise to debate.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. If it is going to be debated, I withdraw it.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I wish to move an additional rule. It is not necessary at all to debate the matter, I imagine, since the subject has been already before the House in connection with other topics. I move the following :

"That the Secretary shall cause stenographic reports to be taken of all discussions in secret session."

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that that be laid on the table for the present. It is very important that we should adopt the rules now, and that can come up to-morrow.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I doubt whether to-morrow I shall be in order in offering this additional rule. I shall be then required to postpone it to another day and then renew a subject which is now quite fresh in the minds of members. I do not desire any discussion at all. I do not propose to say a word. Everybody has heard the reasons for holding sessions in secret. Everybody has also heard the reasons why no man should be allowed to speak here upon the character of individuals without a record being made of the precise words used. Therefore I must press the question.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move to lay the proposed rule on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It cannot be laid on the table without carrying along with it the whole rules.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I withdraw my motion.

Rev. Mr. BIRDSALL, of California. Our voting this down does not prevent our employing a reporter at any time for any particular discussion in secret session ?

The PRESIDENT. It does not. The question is on the proposed rule moved by the deputy from Alabama.

The rule was rejected—ayes 58, noes not counted.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I should like to have the name of the Committee "on Amendments to the Constitution" changed to "Committee on the Constitution."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. It now corresponds with the same committee in the House of Bishops. We

ought to follow that. There is no necessity for such a committee, unless there are amendments to the Constitution to be proposed.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Is that in order? We have passed over that matter.

The PRESIDENT. I do not think it is in order to go back.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. We have a Committee on Canons. Let us have one on the Constitution.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. This is only to preserve the symmetry of our committees. We have a Committee on Canons, not on amendments to Canons.

Rev. Mr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. We can make a canon, but we cannot make a constitution. The proper title is "Committee on Amendments of the Constitution," not "on the Constitution."

The PRESIDENT. It is evident the amendment is not favored by the House, and therefore I will put the motion made by Dr. Beach on the adoption of the rules as amended. The question is on that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT. I will now give notice of the appointment of additional committees. There is one indeed under the old rule which has not yet been announced—the Committee on Christian Education. I appoint on that committee

Rev. HENRY A. COIT, of New Hampshire.
Rev. CHARLES MINNIGERODE, of Virginia.
Rev. DANIEL R. GOODWIN, of Pennsylvania.
Rev. ALDERT SMEDES, of North Carolina.
Rev. GEORGE BECKETT, of Georgia.
Rev. EDWIN E. JOHNSON, of Connecticut.
Rev. GILES A. EASTON, of California.
Mr. NATHANIEL H. R. DAWSON, of Alabama.
Mr. HENRY COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania.
Mr. JOHN B. HOWE, of Indiana.
Mr. CHARLES J. JENKINS, of Georgia.
Mr. GEORGE C. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts.
Mr. ISAAC ATWATER, of Minnesota.

As the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, I appoint:

Rev. CHARLES H. HALL, of Long Island.
Rev. THOMAS U. DUDLEY, of Maryland.
Rev. BENJAMIN A. ROGERS, of Texas.

For a reason which will be apparent to the House, I have appointed but three clergymen on that committee, and the following make up the rest of the committee:

Mr. MORRISON R. WAITE, of Ohio.
Mr. R. C. L. MONCURE, of Virginia.
Mr. JAMES M. WOOLWORTH, of Nebraska.
Mr. GEORGE F. COMSTOCK, of Central New York.
Mr. ELI T. WILDER, of Minnesota.
Mr. JOHN W. STEVENSON, of Kentucky.
Mr. EDWARD MCCRADY, of South Carolina.
Mr. SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, of New York.
Mr. CORTLANDT PARKER, of New Jersey.
Mr. GEORGE W. RACE, of Louisiana.

It is important, as I have long thought, that the wealth of intellectual power which this Church has the privilege to possess in her laity, as represented in this Convention and in all her Conventions, should be utilized, and we put that duty upon those distinguished men.

As the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members, I have appointed:

Rev. ALEXANDER BURGESS, of Massachusetts.
Rev. SAMUEL CHASE, of Illinois.

Rev. WILLIAM F. ADAMS, of Louisiana.
Rev. WALTER AYRAULT, of Central New York.
Rev. THEODORE P. BARBER, of Easton.
Rev. MARCELLUS A. HERRICK, of New Hampshire.

Rev. RICHARD M. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey.

Mr. HARRY I. BODLEY, of Missouri.

Mr. ARMAND J. DE ROSSET, of North Carolina.

Mr. CAMBRIDGE LIVINGSTON, of New York.

Mr. AUGUSTUS H. MOSS, of Ohio.

Mr. WILLIAM WELSH, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JEREMIAH C. GARTHWAITE, of New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut, submitted the following reports:

REPORT No. 1.

The Committee on Canons respectfully report that on the morning of the third day of the session they met for organization, the Rev. William Cooper Mead, D.D., being Chairman, and appointed the Rev. Francis Harrison to be their secretary.

By order of the Committee.

(Signed) WILLIAM COOPER MEAD,
Chairman.

October 9, 1874.

REPORT No. 2.

The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed addition to the Standing Order of the House, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following:

"Section 3. The Secretary of the House of Deputies and the Treasurer of the Convention, although not returned as Deputies to the Convention, shall be entitled to seats upon the floor of the House, and, with the approval of the President, to speak on the subjects of their respective offices.

"Section 4. This order shall always be printed at the close of the Digest, as well as prefixed to the Journal, with the date of its adoption."

By order of the Committee.

(Signed) WM. COOPER MEAD.

October 9, 1874.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I move the adoption of the resolution contained in Report No. 2.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. It has to go on the Calendar and come up to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT. The rule is that the Secretary shall keep a Calendar of business, on which reports of committees, resolutions which lie over, and other matters undisposed of shall be placed in the order in which they are presented, so that this matter may be disposed of now, and the motion is made to adopt this resolution of the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House stands adjourned until to-morrow at the usual hour.

FOURTH DAY.

SATURDAY, October 10.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at 10 A. M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Giles A. Easton, of California. The Lessons were read by Rev. Edwin M. Van Deusen, D.D., of Central New York. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. William Fawcett, D.D., of Central Pennsylvania. The Benediction was pronounced

by the Right Reverend William Mercer Green, D.D., Bishop of Mississippi.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

BISHOPS OF ILLINOIS AND WISCONSIN.

Rev. Dr. COOKE, of New York. The Committee on the Consecration of Bishops have a report to make. Before making the report I beg to call your attention, Mr. President, to the seventeenth rule of order, as adopted yesterday, and to enquire whether the rule will be considered by the President as applying to the report which is now to be made :

"Whenever the election or confirmation of a Bishop is under consideration, the House shall sit with closed doors."

The PRESIDENT. I should not think, speaking promptly on the question, that such a question was under consideration when the report was merely being made. It will come under consideration when the report is before us.

Rev. Dr. COOKE, of New York. I submit the following report :

The Committee on the Consecration of Bishops have had before them the testimonials referred to them of the Rev. Edward R. Welles, D.D., Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Wisconsin, and find after examination that all the rules and Canons of this Church touching the election of a Bishop have been complied with in the case under consideration. The Committee therefore submit for the consideration and action of the House the customary resolutions :

"Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies approve of the testimonials of the Rev. Edward R. Welles, D.D., Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Wisconsin, and give their consent to his consecration.

"Resolved, That the House proceed to sign the proper certificate to be presented to the House of Bishops."

I also, from the same Committee, submit the following report :

"The Committee on the Consecration of Bishops have had before them the testimonials referred to them of the Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D., Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Illinois, and find, after examination, that all the rules and Canons of this Church touching the election of a Bishop have been complied with in the case under consideration. The Committee therefore submit for the consideration and action of the House the customary resolutions :

"Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies approve of the testimonials of the Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D., Bishop-elect of the Diocese of Illinois, and give their consent to his consecration.

"Resolved, That the House proceed to sign the proper certificate to be presented to the House of Bishops."

Mr. CHURCHILL, of Kentucky. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. The Chairman of the Committee will please indicate what disposition he wishes to make of the reports just made—whether they shall lie over or not.

The Rev. Dr. COOKE, of New York. The Committee present the reports and resolutions for the action of the House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. A report when made, under the rules adopted yesterday, goes down on the Calendar, and will come up in its order as a matter of course. I call attention to Rule 6: "The Secretary shall keep a Calendar of business, on which reports from committees, resolutions which lie over,

and other matters undisposed of shall be placed in the order in which they are presented."

The PRESIDENT. That settles the matter. It designates the disposition which shall be made of each report.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to make a simple suggestion as a matter of convenience. I suppose this business goes on the Calendar, and will come up, being first in the order of business, on Monday. I suggest that either at that time or now we make it a special order of business at the opening of the Convention. We can do so when it comes up on the Calendar or now. I would make it the special order of business at the opening of the Convention, immediately after Divine service. That will obviate the necessity of compelling persons to remove from the House, and it will then only be necessary for the ushers to close the House and not admit persons from the outside until we get through that order of business. This would be much more agreeable, I think, to the Convention and to persons without.

I make the suggestion, not for the purpose of interfering with these reports on the Calendar, but for the purpose of giving notice that, when they come up on Monday as the first business in order on the Calendar, I shall move that they be made the special order on the opening of the Convention on the following day, immediately after Divine service.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman not know that there are already some matters on the Calendar in advance of this?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I was not aware of it.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. There are.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. But as it is always allowable to make a special order, I will move, at the suggestion of gentlemen around me, that this be made the special order on the opening of the Convention immediately after Divine service on Tuesday next. I will not include in my motion the direction to the ushers not to admit any person into the House, but of course that direction will be given by the proper officer.

The PRESIDENT. It will require a two-thirds vote to pass that resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. To make a special order?

The PRESIDENT. In the form presented, because it repeals a rule of order already made.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Let us see, sir. We go to the Calendar at twelve o'clock, unless there be an order of the day. I think the seventh rule contemplates the universal practice of all bodies to make an order of the day, and that this rule is in subordination to that general principle.

The PRESIDENT. My decision has no reference to the Calendar, but it is because the rules distinctly specify the order of business. Of course, the House can suspend the rule of order for this purpose, but it will require a two-thirds vote to do so.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Do I understand the Chair to decide that the House cannot, except by a vote of two-thirds, fix any matter as a special order for any particular time?

The PRESIDENT. At any particular time which violates the order of business as prescribed by the rules.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. But the 7th Rule prescribes that the Calendar shall be taken up at 12 o'clock.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I understand the rule to be (and I think those wise in parliamentary law will sustain me) that the matter of making anything a special order is part of the control of its proceedings which exists in every deliberative body by a mere majority at all times. It

does not conflict with anything, but simply postpones to a particular time the matter in hand, and fixes when it shall be taken up. However, if the Chair is of the opinion he has indicated, I will not insist on this motion, but will pursue the course which I stated before, and when these reports are called up in their place on the Calendar, on Monday, I will move to make them the order of business for Tuesday morning.

ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED BY CHICAGO FIRE.

Rev. Dr. LOCKE, of Illinois, submitted the following report :

"The Rev. Dr. Locke, who was appointed by the last General Convention, with the Bishop and Clergy of Chicago, a committee to receive and distribute the alms of the Church contributed for the relief of the Church organizations disabled by the Chicago fire, feels that it devolves upon him, the Bishop being dead, to report the amount and the use of those alms.

"He submits, then, the following report, omitting all the several items and stating the gross amounts. The items are not necessary, for every one has been separately acknowledged to the donor at the time of receipt:

CHURCH RELIEF FUND.

Dr.

Receipts by Dr. Locke, ...	\$22,793 05
Receipts by Bishop Whitehouse, ...	20,101 69
Interest on same, ...	723 16
Receipts by Dr. Locke for Church Hospital, ...	2,435 65
Receipts by Dr. Locke for personal distribution, ...	4,660 76
	\$50,714 31

Cr.

Clergy—Personal Relief, ...	\$3,500 87
Charity Fund, ...	5,937 81
Churches—Trinity Church, ...	5,000 00
" St. James' "	4,345 85
" Holy Communion, ...	1,500 00
St. Luke's Hospital, ...	1,100 00
St. Ansgarius, Swedish, for lots, ...	8,950 00
" for Church Building, ...	10,942 54
Paid by Dr. Locke to St. Luke's Hospital, ...	2,435 65
Distributed by him, ...	4,660 76
Mayor, Chicago, special, ...	128 41
Charges, Freight, etc., ...	22 96
Balance in hand for "Ascension Church,"	2,189 44
	\$50,714 31

"Besides all this, large sums were sent to individual clergy, which are not here reported, because they never came before the Committee, and there were also immense supplies of clothing and stores sent to each parish, all of which was acknowledged and faithfully distributed.

"The undersigned, on behalf of all the Churches, so severely injured by the fire, and especially on behalf of the Church Hospital, of which he is the President, begs leave gratefully to acknowledge the abundant generosity of the General Church.

"CLINTON LOCKE,

"Treasurer appointed by General Convention of 1871, of Chicago Relief Fund."

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that this report be printed on the Journal and the Committee discharged.

The motion was agreed to.

THE NICENE CREED.

The PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are now in order.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLAS, of Mississippi. I present a memorial of the Diocese of Mississippi in regard to the Nicene Creed. As this memorial has already been read in substance, I move its reference to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. Payne, of Albany; Rev. Mr. Schuyler, of Missouri; Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Texas; Rev. Mr. Trimble, of Arkansas; Rev. Dr. Scarborough, of Pittsburgh; Rev. Dr. Stringfellow, of Alabama; and Rev. Mr. Bliss, of Vermont, presented memorials on the same subject from their respective Dioceses, which were referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have a memorial of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, asking this General Convention to take such steps as will result in the establishment of a Court of Appeal, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I have a memorial of the same nature from the Diocese of Texas.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. In behalf of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, I submit that the measure suggested will require an amendment of the Constitution, and the question should properly go to that Committee, and not to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. The Committee on Canons at the last Convention, if I remember aright, reported on the subject, and reported that it involved an amendment to the Constitution. I think, therefore, the appropriate reference is to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. We are certainly not bound by the action of the last Committee on Canons. The House did not approve of the report, and, of course, it now remains an open question. This memorial which I have presented does not in form ask for change of the Constitution. Therefore it ought not properly to be referred to the Committee on changes in the Constitution. If the Committee on Canons should come to the conclusion that it does require a change in the Constitution, then the proper action can be had; they will so report to the House and have it sent to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution; but until they have so reported, there being nothing in the memorial which looks to a change in the Constitution, it seems to me that the proper committee to receive it, in the first place, is the Committee on Canons.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I wish to ask a question. Did not the Committee on Canons report, at the last Convention, that it required an amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. There was a report to that effect, but that report was withdrawn and another report subsequently presented, which never was acted upon, on account of the late period of the session at which the report was made. There was a division of opinion in that Committee, as to whether a change in the Constitution was necessary or not; but even if that Committee had been unanimous that it did require a change in the Constitution, the action of that Committee would not foreclose the case and prevent its going before the present Committee, who may think differently, and by an equally unanimous vote decide that a Canon is sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I am not willing to undertake the labor of preparing a system for a Court of Appeals, and therefore I withdraw my motion.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. The motion I made does not rest at all upon the action of the last

Committee on Canons; it rests on the intrinsic nature of the thing itself. How is it possible to establish a Court of Appeals in this Church without a fundamental, radical, and vital change in the Constitution? It is the most important tribunal that could possibly be made. We have established a committee for the very purpose of considering amendments to the Constitution in all their length and breadth—in all their gravity; and I do insist for that Committee that they are entitled to examine the subject. It ought to go to that Committee, and none other, to take primary action; therefore I renew my motion that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. As long as I am sustained in the opinion which I do entertain by the Hon. Murray Hoffman, that a change in the Constitution is not necessary to establish a Court of Appeals, I insist upon my motion that this memorial go before the Committee on Canons. He has a long discussion of the matter, as will be found by any gentleman reading his book on the Church, and comes to the final conclusion that a change in the Constitution is not necessary. Members of the present House probably who were members of the House of 1850 and 1853 will remember that the Committee on Canons, composed in part of Dr. Hawks, Judge Hoffman, Judge Chambers, and Hugh Davy Evans, of Maryland, reported a Canon providing for the establishment of a Court of Appeal. The constitutional question was then scarcely raised. The Canon failed, not because of any constitutional objection, but because of another matter which it is not now necessary to allude to. But those gentlemen, whose authority I presume will be acknowledged by every member of this House, were of the opinion that this tribunal could be provided without changing the Constitution. I think at all events, *prima facie*, it goes to the Committee on Canons, because the memorial itself does not ask for a change in the Constitution, and we have no right to presume that it does require a change of the Constitution until the Committee to whom we refer it, and who *prima facie* are the proper recipients of it, shall so report to the House. If the memorial itself asked for a change of the Constitution, then as a matter of course it should go to the Committee on Amendments of the Constitution; but inasmuch as it does not, the proper committee is, the Committee on Canons.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I wish to state a historical fact which I happen to know as to the authority of Judge Hoffman. It is true that the effort was first made before the Committee on Canons as far back as 1850, but it was found not practicable to carry it through, and thereupon a constitutional amendment was proposed for a Court of Appeal by Judge Hoffman himself, and that was passed with hardly an objection in the General Convention of 1856. I had the honor to take a seat for the first time in the Convention at Richmond in 1859, when the measure was brought up for its second reading as a constitutional amendment. I felt it my duty on that occasion (in which I was strongly seconded by my reverend friend from Virginia, Dr. Andrews, who knows the fact) to rise at once, and oppose that amendment as destructive of all the usages of the Church. It was argued at great length at Richmond, and the Court of Appeals was voted down by a vote by orders of 29 to 3. That is a historical fact. It has always been deemed a subject of constitutional provision. If in the face and eyes of all that, this body is now ready to really displace the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution who ought to examine this matter, and send it to the Committee on Canons upon the mere *ipse dixit* of Judge Hoffman, which

he himself retracted, they will establish a dangerous precedent.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I rise to a question of order. This debate is going to be prolonged considerably from present appearances, and I revoke the twelfth rule of order: "There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee, or upon a motion to recommend any subject which has been before a committee."

The PRESIDENT. I was about to bring that rule of order to the attention of the House.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. It is a new rule. We are not yet familiar with it. I call attention to it now, that we may stop this debate.

The PRESIDENT. I do not know that we can do it under that rule. I was about to mention it myself as an illustration of the impossibility of using human language so as to control human action in the diversity of human affairs. It says, "There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee;" but here comes up the question whether this memorial shall be referred to one committee or another, and therefore the letter of the rule hardly applies.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I wish to state to my friend from Pittsburgh the fact that heretofore we have had no Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and that this very morning a memorial came before the Committee on Canons, on which I hold now in my hand the action of that Committee, for the purpose of presenting it at the proper time to the House, to be referred to this very Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, because the Committee on Canons, as we deem, has nothing to do with it. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that he consent to the reference at once of this matter to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. It would be sent from the Committee on Canons in the end, undoubtedly to the Committee on Amendments of the Constitution, and I want to simplify the business.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to a question of order. A point of order was made, and the Chair ruled that this matter could not be debated, but must go to a committee without debate. I raise the point of order that the case comes not within that rule. When that rule was under discussion, I went to a very distinguished gentleman learned and familiar with parliamentary law, and told him that this very doubt would arise on the first thing that came before the Convention. I think a resolution to refer is not a motion to refer a matter before the House. A resolution to refer a matter relates to a resolution which for the first time brings a subject before the House. It does not refer to a motion to commit a matter which comes before the House in the ordinary way.

I want the ruling settled now as to that question of order, for it lies at the foundation of our whole proceedings. Let me explain. If a matter is introduced here that has not been before a committee, and discussion takes place upon it, a motion to commit it to a committee is debatable under our rules. If, however, a gentleman comes upon the floor and offers a resolution declaring that such and such a subject be referred to a committee to report on it to this House, that cannot be debated. That is the difference. If it be a matter introduced and entertained by this House, the mere motion to commit it is debatable, because the very next clause in that same rule says that a motion to recommit shall not be debatable, and by strong implication a motion to commit for the first time a matter that has never been before a committee, and is introduced originally in the form of a motion to refer, is debatable. I want that settled.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I maintain that the gentleman makes a distinction without a difference. The twelfth rule of order says :

"There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer"—What? To refer that resolution, as the gentleman's argument indicates? No; but—"any subject."

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. The rule says that the Chair shall decide all questions of order without debate.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair listened very attentively to one gentleman making his point of order. In order that the mind of the Chair might be informed, he was willing to listen to an argument on the other side. I believe that is legitimate. When the Chair decides a question, of course he can do it without allowing anybody to debate.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I ask for the decision of the point of order.

The PRESIDENT. I can easily decide it. I do not require any argument on the opposite side on the point of order made by Mr. Montgomery. I decide that there can be no debate on a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee. But the question before us is, as I stated, a variation of the rule. It is as to which committee this memorial shall be referred. Whether the variation is sufficient to justify debate I do not know, and I will ask the opinion of this House upon that point before we proceed further.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. Is it competent to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair, made just now, as to whether debate is in order?

The PRESIDENT. No, because that is an abstract question, which is not before us. The question before us is whether there is a sufficient variation from the rule in the contest which has sprung up, to justify debate as to the committee to which this memorial should be referred.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I understand that; but the Chair just now decided that a motion to commit is not debatable under any circumstances; and if that is to apply to the House during the present session, I wish to take an appeal from that decision. This is the only time we can take an appeal, I suppose, from that decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT. That question is not now before us.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. The Chair decided the question, and I take an appeal from his decision.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Mr. President, if it is desirable to have this question decided now, I have no objection to having it decided; but I was about to modify the motion as first made, so as possibly to relieve the House from further discussion.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman has made a motion to commit to the Committee on Canons. That is not debatable; but there comes in an amendment, a different proposition as a substitute, to commit to another committee. Now, that stands before the House as the subject for decision, and is not debatable either.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. It is twelve o'clock, and I call for the order of the day.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The question should be put on the amendment first without debate, and then on the original proposition, if the amendment is voted down, without debate. ["Right"]

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. The eighteenth rule says :

"All questions of order shall be decided by the Chair without debate; but any member may appeal from such decision; and on such appeal no member shall speak more than once without express

leave of the House." The Chair made a decision. I appeal from that decision.

The PRESIDENT. An appeal is made from the decision of the Chair.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Let me suggest a point of order. The decision of the Chair is now not pertinent. We stand on the original motion as amended, and the Chair may make his decision upon that, and the subject is withdrawn from the House on which the gentleman wishes to appeal.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. The Chair has decided already.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I hold that the duty of the Chair, under the rule, is to take the original motion, if there be no amendment, and put the question to the House, and if the House vote "aye," to send it to that committee; and there is an end of it. If an amendment is moved, the Chair should put the question on the amendment without debate.

The PRESIDENT. I believe that is right.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. If there be an appeal from the decision of the Chair, that is another question.

The PRESIDENT. I believe that is right, and therefore the appeal now lies. I have decided that a motion to refer must be without debate, except the five minutes allowed to the proposer of it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I propose to modify my motion.

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman from Easton withdraw his appeal to admit the modification?

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. Can I renew the appeal?

The PRESIDENT. Of course.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. In deference to the opinion of the Chairman of the Committee on Canons, I modify my motion so as to move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to report to this House whether it requires a change in the Constitution to establish a Court of Appeals. If they shall so report, then, of course, we shall have the matter before us to decide. If they report to the contrary, then this memorial will go before the Committee on Canons, if the House so decide, to prepare and report to the House a plan for a Court of Appeal.

The PRESIDENT. The motion now is to refer to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Simply to report upon this one point, as to whether a change in the Constitution is required to establish a Court of Appeal.

The PRESIDENT. Is the resolution in writing to that effect?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have not written it, but it can be reduced to writing in a moment.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. That suggestion, I think, ought to be satisfactory to every member of the House.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. There is no question about that, but my appeal was on another point.

Rev. Dr. PETTIS, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order, that it is past 12 o'clock, and we must proceed to the order of the day.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I ask that the resolution relating to a change of the Constitution be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT. The rule must first be suspended so as to refer the matter of the Texas memorial to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The Committee on Canons are prepared to report back the memorial

from Texas for the purpose of referring it to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Burgwin's resolution is first in order, and it will now be read.

The Secretary read as follows :

"Resolved, That the memorial from the Diocese of Pittsburgh be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to report whether a change in the Constitution be necessary in order to the establishment of a Court of Appeal."

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE V. OF CONSTITUTION.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred certain memorials from the Dioceses of California and Texas, respectfully report that before discharging fully the duty devolved upon them it will be necessary to have acted upon a preliminary question referred to in the following resolution, which they respectfully submit for the consideration of the House.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution be requested to enquire and report whether the suggested amendment to the Constitution, found on page 201 of the Journal of this House of 1871, and in Message 67, page 360 of the Journal of the House of Bishops, has been proposed to the Dioceses, according to the Constitution, and whether, if so proposed, due notice of such amendment has been given to the Diocesan Conventions, in pursuance of Article IX. of the Constitution, and of Section 3 of Canon 1, Title III., of the Digest."

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I move the reference of that to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

NEW DIOCESE IN WISCONSIN.

The Rev. Mr. HAFF, of Wisconsin, presented a memorial of the Diocese of Wisconsin, and accompanying papers in reference to the erection of a new Diocese therein, which were referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONVENTION.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, at the late Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts, held in May of this year, the following resolution was passed :

"Resolved, By the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts, that the Deputies to the General Convention be instructed to request the General Convention to consider whether any modification of Canon 4, Title II., of the General Canons, be necessary or desirable."

On behalf of the Deputies of the Diocese of Massachusetts I present this resolution to the General Convention. The Canon is the Canon "of differences between ministers and their congregations, and of the dissolution of a pastoral connection." As we understand it, the design of the resolution was to request the Convention to consider if, by the provision of the Canon, the rights of rectors and assistant ministers are secured and sufficiently guarded. I move that the resolution of the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts be referred to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to consider and report accordingly.

The motion was agreed to.

LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

The following message (No. 5) was received from the House of Bishops :

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it concurs in Message No. 2 of the House of Deputies relating to a Committee to wait upon the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, and that it has appointed as the Committee on the part of this House the Bishops of Michigan and Maryland."

NEW DIOCESE IN NEW JERSEY.

The following message (No. 6) was received from the House of Bishops :

The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That this Convention hereby consents to and ratifies the formation of a new Diocese within the limits of the Diocese of New Jersey, to be composed of the seven northern counties of the State, viz., the counties of Sussex, Warren, Morris, Passaic, Bergen, Hudson, and Essex, together with the township of Summit in Union County."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the concurrence of this House in the last message.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I ask if we have not the subject before a committee of our own House, and would it not be more respectful to our own committee to wait until they report, and if they report for concurrence then to concur?

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. They have reported.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Very well.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I hope the message just sent down will be concurred in.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to concur in the message relating to the Diocese of New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

BOARD OF MISSIONS.

Mr. McWHORTER, of Central New York, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to :

"Resolved, That this House proceed to ballot, at 12 o'clock meridian on the 12th of October (Monday next), for a committee of three clergymen and three laymen to act with a Committee of the House of Bishops to name a Board of Missions."

DROPPED CANONS.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I offer the following resolution :

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to consider and report whether Canon 8, 'Of Ministers officiating in a Foreign Language,' and Canon 9, 'Of the Admission of Ministers ordained by Bishops not in communion with this Church,' being Canons of Title I. of the Digest of 1863, but not found in the Digest of 1871, are not still a part of the Canon law of this Church."

These two Canons are omitted in the last Digest, but having not been repealed, I therefore make this motion, which is a proper one, that the Committee may report upon the matter.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I offer the following resolution :

"Resolved (The House of Bishops concurring), That the words 'Bishops and,' in the third line of Section 3, of Canon 4, of Title II., be omitted."

This is the Canon to which attention was just called by the Deputy from Massachusetts, the Canon "Of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection." This Canon was amended at the last General Convention in this House ; the amendments were sent up to the other House and certain words were stricken out there. It was intended by our Committee that the Bishop should be one of the Board of Reference, and

so the language was, "the Bishop and five Presbyters." The House of Bishops, through their Committee, struck out the words "Bishop and," leaving the matter to the Presbyters. They did so in every instance except in this third section; so that it is necessary, in order to make the Canon consistent, that the words "Bishop and," in the third section, should be stricken out. It now reads, "If any rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the recommendation of the Bishop and Presbyters." The Bishop has made no recommendation. The Bishop may be opposed to the finding of the Presbyters, but still he has to carry out their recommendation. It is, therefore, necessary that these words "Bishop and" be removed.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

NEW DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 2, of Canon 6, of Title III., be amended by inserting after the words 'standing committee' in the sixth line, the following words: 'of the Diocese within the limits of which the new Diocese is to be erected, or of the Standing Committee.'"

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. It is whether discussion of the subject-matter is in order on a mere question of reference?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman moving a resolution of reference has a right to speak five minutes on it.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I will not speak three. The title of the Canon is "Of the Organization of New Dioceses." It is provided in the first section of the Canon that a new Diocese may be formed within the limits of another Diocese, or by the junction of two or more Dioceses, or parts of Dioceses, the same to be ratified by the General Convention and the Bishop of the Diocese within the limits of which another is formed; or, in case of the junction of two or more Dioceses, or parts of Dioceses, the Bishop of eldest consecration over the Dioceses furnishing portions of such new Diocese shall thereupon call the Primary Convention of the new Diocese, for the purpose of enabling it to organize, and shall fix the time and place of holding the same, etc. The second section provides:

"In case there should be no Bishop who can call such Primary Convention, pursuant to the foregoing provisions, then the duty of calling such Convention for the purpose of organizing, and the duty of fixing the time and place of its meeting, shall be vested in the Standing Committee of the eldest of the Dioceses by the junction of which, or parts of which, the new Diocese may be formed."

This section omits to make a provision for the calling of a Primary Convention in a new Diocese, erected within the limits of an existing Diocese—the case which we just had before us of the new Diocese of New Jersey, formed within the limits of an existing Diocese. I will illustrate the matter. If a Convention in one of our existing Dioceses should agree to the formation of a new Diocese within its limits, and the Bishop should give his consent; if all the papers should be properly perfected, yet if, in the providence of God, the Bishop should be taken from the Diocese—even though the General Convention gave its consent to the erection of the new Diocese—a Primary Convention of the new Diocese could not be called; there would be no authority to call it. It is a singular omission. I thought at first it must be an omission of the printers, but I went carefully back through Digest after Digest, and through all the Journals to 1838, and I found that this section stands in the Canons of 1838 precisely as we have it here. There is no provision for

the calling of a Primary Convention by a standing committee of a Diocese, when a new Diocese is erected within the limits of an existing Diocese.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The eldest Diocese has a standing committee.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. But that is in the other case, when a new Diocese is formed by the junction of parts of two or more Dioceses.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Section 2 says:

"In case there should be no Bishop who can call such Primary Convention pursuant to the foregoing provisions, then the duty of calling such Convention for the purpose of organizing, and the duty of fixing the time and place of its meeting, shall be vested in the Standing Committee of the eldest of the Dioceses"—

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. But go on:

"By the junction of which, or parts of which, the new Diocese may be formed."

I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

RITUAL UNIFORMITY.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Whereas, The General Convention of 1871 declined to enact any restrictive law on Ritual Uniformity, but in lieu of it passed the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That this Convention hereby expresses its decided condemnation of ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church.

"Resolved, That, in the judgment of this House, the paternal counsel and advice of the Right Reverend Fathers, the Bishops of the Church, is deemed sufficient at this time to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church, and in the administration of the Holy Sacraments."

"And whereas, 'Our Right Rev. Fathers, the Bishops of the Church,' did 'draw up and cause to be published a Pastoral Letter to the members of the Church,' which Pastoral Letter, after Divine service duly celebrated, was read in the presence of both Houses of the General Convention by the Right Rev. the Bishop presiding in the House of Bishops;

"And whereas, In the aforesaid Pastoral Letter, 'our Right Rev. Fathers, the Bishops of the Church,' gave their paternal counsel and advice, using the following words:

"We counsel you to bear in mind that while, on the one hand, we must not suffer ourselves to deny any real good by reason of mere popular outcries against Ritual forms, so we are never to allow professions of self-denying labor and service to blind us to the actual dangers of any movement in the Church. What is known as Ritualism is mainly a question of taste, temperament, and constitution, until it becomes the expression of doctrine.

"The doctrine which chiefly attempts as yet to express itself by Ritual in questionable and dangerous ways is connected with the Holy Eucharist. That doctrine is emphatically a novelty in theology. What is known as Eucharistic adoration is undoubtedly inculcated and encouraged by that Ritual of posture lately introduced among us, which finds no warrant in our office for the administration of the Holy Communion."

"And whereas, The above solemn words of counsel and warning of 'our Right Reverend Fathers, the Bishops of the Church,' have not proved sufficient to check and suppress ritual practices and ceremonies which have been thus most emphatically characterized as 'questionable and dangerous,' and 'which find no warrant in our office for the administration of the Holy Communion.' Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following Canon of Ritual Uniformity be enacted :

"Canon of Ritual Uniformity.

"Sec. 1. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects toward which adoration is to be made, in or after the prayer of consecration, or in the act of administering, or in conveying them to or from the communicants ; bowings, crossings, genuflections, prostrations, reverences, bowing down upon or kissing the Lord's Table, and kneeling, except as allowed, provided for, or directed by Rubric or Canon; and any gesture, posture, or act, implying such adoration, and any ceremony not prescribed as part of "the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion" ; likewise the use at any administration of the Holy Communion of any Hymns, Prayers, Collects, Epistles, or Gospels other than those appointed in the authorized formularies of the Church, are hereby forbidden.

"Sec. 2. In all matters pertaining to the Public Worship of the Church, to the ornaments, arrangements, and appointments of the Holy Table, and in everything connected with Ritual in the performance of Divine Service, including the vestments to be used, about which there is no specific direction in the Book of Common Prayer, or the Offices and Ordinal thereto appended, or in any Legislation, General or Diocesan, of this Church, the admonition or judgment of the Bishop of any Diocese, given in writing, shall be regarded as binding, to be followed and obeyed by every minister of that Diocese."

ENGLISH CHURCH CONGRESS.

The PRESIDENT. Just now a letter was handed me directed "to the President, if Mr. Edwards is not present." Mr. Edwards not being in the House, I have opened the letter, and find it to be from the Bishop of Lichfield in these words :

"Please to request the President to obtain the consent of the House of Deputies to allow you to present the enclosed invitation from the Congress at Brighton to the Bishops and Clergy to attend the Congress proposed to be held at Stoke in 1875.

"Yours most truly,

"G. A. LICHFIELD."

This telegram contains the invitation :

"BRIGHTON, October 9, 1874.

"BISHOP OF LICHFIELD, New York, America :

"Convention, New York.—Congress meets next year at Stoke (D.V.) Invite American Bishops and Clergy.

"BISHOP OF CHICHESTER, President."

It is for the House to make such disposition of the matter as propriety and courtesy require.

The Rev. Dr. DALZELL, of Louisiana. I move that the President of this House be requested to send a response to the Bishop of Chichester, for the Congress sitting at Brighton, acknowledging the kind invitation.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. I have a resolution to offer of business simply, and without any preamble.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be in-

structed to report a Canon or rule of order for the proper organization of the General Convention at the commencement of each regular session thereof ; and that it consider and report upon the election of one or more Vice-Presidents to preside in the absence of the President from the Chair."

To this date, sir, neither the Constitution nor Canons nor the rules of order that have been adopted provide for the organization of this House. Only in a rule of order made in 1847, prescribing the duties of the Secretary, is the office of President mentioned, and then merely incidentally. It is with a view to correct this omission that I offer this resolution.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I move to insert "House of Deputies" in place of "General Convention."

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. I mean of course the House of Deputies, and I accept the amendment. I did not propose that we shall organize anything that we do not have the control of.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

ADORATION OF THE ELEMENTS.

Mr. CHURCHILL, of Kentucky. I offer the following resolution :

"Resolved by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies (the House of Bishops concurring), That every minister in this Church shall be liable to presentment and trial for using any ritual acts or observances which teach or symbolize any doctrine contrary to that held by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and that the authorities of the Church shall take steps with all reasonable promptness to suppress all ceremonies, services, or ritual acts which symbolize or teach the doctrine of the adoration of Christ corporally present in the Elements upon the Altar."

I merely move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons. I shall say nothing about it.

The motion to refer was agreed to.

VIRGINIA ON RITUAL UNIFORMITY.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia, submitted the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the preamble and resolutions of the Council of the Diocese of Virginia, in response to so much of the Bishop's address as related to Ritualism, adopted on the 22d day of May, 1874 (a copy of which is herewith submitted), be referred to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to enquire into the expediency of reporting a Canon in conformity with the suggestions therein contained."

Copy of the Preamble and Resolutions of Virginia.

"The Council of the Diocese of Virginia, viewing with great concern the introduction of Romish errors in the Protestant Episcopal Church—viz. : in the open avowal of a doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, differing from the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation by distinctions which to the common understanding seem merely 'speculative and nugatory,' and which, 'by means of accessories of lights, music, vestments, incense, postures, genuflections, and adorations,' tends to change the Holy Communion of the Prayer-Book into the Romish Mass; in the encouragement given to members of our Communion by their pastors to practise auricular confession, and to receive private absolution, in imitation of the Romish Sacrament of Penance ; in the offering of prayers for the dead, invocation of saints and angels, and worship of the

Virgin Mary, after the manner of the Church of Rome; together with other assimilations in teaching and practice to the doctrine of the Church of Rome—feels constrained to express a deep conviction that the continued existence of these alien elements in our beloved Church, not only impedes her growth and prosperity, but, if unchecked, must destroy her Protestant character. Therefore,

“Resolved, That our Deputies to the next General Convention be instructed to use their earnest endeavors to obtain efficient legislation for the removal of Romish errors and practices from the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the enforcement of such legislation by proper discipline.”

“Resolved, That this Council does not believe any legislation would be effective for removing the doctrines and practices referred to, which shall not expressly forbid, in the administration of the Holy Communion and on other occasions of public worship, the acts hereinafter enumerated, to wit:

“1. The use of incense.
“2. Placing or retaining a crucifix in any part of the church.

“3. Carrying a cross in procession in the church.

“4. The use of lights on or about the Holy Table except when necessary.

“5. The elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion, in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects toward which adoration is to be made, in or after the prayer of consecration, or in the act of administering them, or in conveying them to or from the communicants.

“6. The mixing of water with the wine as part of the service, or in the presence of the congregation.

“7. The washing of the priest's hands, or the abolition of the vessels, in the presence of the congregation.

“8. Bowings, crossings, genuflexions, prostrations, reverences, bowing down upon or kissing the Holy Table, and kneeling, except as allowed, provided for, or directed by Rubric or Canon; it being *provided* that reverence at the mention of the name of the Lord Jesus is not intended to be disallowed; and it being further *provided* that private personal devotion, before or after official ministration, is not to be understood to include or justify any of the acts prohibited.

“9. The celebration or receiving of the Holy Communion by any Bishop or Priest when no person receives with him.

“10. Employing or permitting any person or persons, not in Holy Orders, to assist the Minister in any part of the order for the administration of the Holy Communion.

“11. Using, at any administration of the Holy Communion, any Prayers, Collects, Gospels, or Epistles, other than those provided in the Book of Common Prayer, or under Section 14, of Canon 13, of Title I, of the Digest.

“12. The use of wafer-bread in the Holy Communion.

“The practice of auricular confession and private absolution should likewise be forbidden, and all other practices and usages not sanctioned by the Book of Common Prayer.

“No clerical vestment should be used, except the present Episcopal robes, a white surplice, a black or white stole, a black cassock, a black gown and bands.”

The PRESIDENT. What motion is made?

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. I move simply to refer the matter to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF COMMUNICANTS.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

“Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to enquire as to the expediency of amending Section 1 of Canon 12, Title II, of the Digest, so that the word ‘not’ shall follow the words ‘be required,’ instead of preceding the same.”

REDUCTION OF NUMBER OF DEPUTIES.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. I offer the following resolution, to be referred to the Committee on Canons:

“Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to enquire and report upon the expediency of reducing the number of representatives from eight to four, two of each order, from each diocese entitled to representation in this body.”

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I would ask to add to that these words, “and how far such rule could be passed without an amendment of the Constitution.” I believe it does not require an amendment to the Constitution; but I want that question enquired into by the Committee.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. Let the resolution be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. The motion now is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE HYMNAL.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. I offer the following resolution:

“Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a special Joint Committee on the Hymnal be appointed to enquire whether the instructions of the General Convention of 1871, directing the publication of the Hymnal as expressed in the resolution on page 153 of the Journal of that year, have been carried out. The said Committee shall consist, on the part of this House, of — presbyters and — laymen, designated by the Chair, and shall make report to this Convention at an early day.”

I should like to claim the privilege allowed of a few minutes' explanation. It is with great unwillingness that I rise to this matter, for it involves much that is in itself unpleasant. It seems to reflect upon the fidelity to a committed trust on the part of those whom we admire, and whose character stands in the estimation of no one higher than in my own. That which I have to state was known to me two and a half years ago. I supposed it was known to others also, and would be brought to the attention of the Church. It is now fifteen months since, in two of the most widely-published papers in the Church, the substance of what I am about to say was made known. Two months ago it was published again, more particularly, under my own signature. It was to the effect that this Hymnal adopted three years ago by an almost unanimous vote has not been, according to the intention of the Convention, published. It has been said in various quarters, and I think proved—it has been proved by the Conventions of the Church—that changes, many unauthorized, have been made in this book. On page 153 of the Journal of the last Convention of the House of Deputies, permission was granted to the Committee on the Hymnal to correct literary blemishes and certain inaccuracies, to omit eleven specified hymns, and to add several hymns. The first lines of something like thirty-one or thirty-two hymns were read. They are not on the Journal, and not on the pages of the stenographic report.

I will not go through all the changes, but the fact stands that the Committee or the publishers omitted the eleven specified hymns, and ten more; they inserted forty-six hymns; they selected and applied over four hundred texts of Scripture which are not in

this book, which was adopted. Not only that, but they have changed hymns over and over again.

A member of that Committee, the Bishop of Western New York, has stated in public that he did not know how the "Rock of Ages" came to be printed as it is. It is in the Hymnal adopted, I think, precisely as it is in the Prayer-Book. It is, in this book, which has been published, in one additional stanza, four stanzas, and many changes in the phraseology. It is necessary only to look to the very first hymn in this Hymnal as printed to see the liberties that have been taken. The first hymn in the Hymnal printed is not the first hymn in the Hymnal proposed. The general arrangement of the hymns has been changed. In this first hymn I have here thirteen changes noted, changes some of them unimportant, some of them in capitalization, some in punctuation, some in the change of a single word; but in the very first hymn in the Hymnal one stanza has been omitted and two have been inserted. The second hymn is somewhat better. I have enumerated there several changes in punctuation and phraseology. The last line of the fourth hymn is changed from "The Nazarene, the Crucified" to "O God! is this the Crucified?" and the fifth stanza has been omitted altogether.

I think I have said enough. The book is before you, and any one can look at it. The marks of the proof-readings of variations in this Hymnal, printed from the Hymnal adopted, are, I believe, over 1,500. Some of them are very slight, but I submit whether, in any book that the Convention has adopted and sent forth to be used in the worship of the Church, fidelity to a committed trust does not compel the Committee to change not a point or a letter in it, any more than they would in the standard Prayer-Book of the Church, without clear instructions to that effect.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution leaves a blank.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. I suggest two clergymen and two laymen, and I would ask the President to depart from the usual rule of appointing the mover of the resolution on the committee, because my verdict has gone forth.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be modified by so filling the blank.

The resolution was agreed to, and the President subsequently appointed Rev. Dr. Benedict, of Georgia, Rev. Dr. Rudder, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Coppée, of Central Pennsylvania, and Mr. Bennett, of Massachusetts, as the Committee.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE V.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Amendments of the Constitution be instructed to enquire whether the amendment to the fifth article of the Constitution was adopted at the last Convention."

The reason why I offer this resolution is briefly this: The amendment was never passed by the House of Bishops. The House of Bishops never acted on it. The Convention adjourned before the expiration of the three days allowed them in the Constitution. There is a precedent of 1853 which may be claimed for its passage. If it be a precedent I hope the Convention will repudiate it. I think it dangerous in the extreme that when this Convention adjourns before the expiration of three days, and the House of Bishops has not replied to our action, such canons or amendments to the Constitution as we have sent them should be regarded as adopted. I am anxious to see the amendment in this case adopted, but I do not like the mode in which it is proposed to be adopted. I have nothing more to say, except simply to refer

the question to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to tell whether that principle is the law of this Church.

The resolution was so referred.

HOUR OF ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. CORBETT, of Illinois. As time is required to prepare this church for Divine service tomorrow, I move that we continue in session to-day until two o'clock, and then adjourn for the day.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GENERAL CONVENTION.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton, submitted the following resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the alterations to the Constitution set forth in the following resolutions be proposed, and that the same be made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, in pursuance of Article IX. of the Constitution, viz.:

"1. Resolved, That Article II. of the Constitution be amended by prefixing the two following paragraphs, viz.:

"The General Convention shall be composed of two Houses—the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies.

"The House of Bishops shall consist of all the Bishops of this Church having Diocesan or Missionary jurisdictions, and of the Assistant Bishops of the Church."

"2. Resolved, That resolved that Article II. be further amended by striking out the phrase commencing, viz., "The Church in each Diocese shall be entitled to a representation of both the clergy and the laity," and inserting instead thereof the words following, "The House of Deputies shall consist of a representation of both the clergy and the laity of the Church in each Diocese."

"3. Resolved, That Article III. of the Constitution be stricken out, and the following be inserted instead thereof, viz.:

"Article III. The two Houses shall in all legislative matters be co-ordinate, each having a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other; and when any proposed act shall have passed either House, the same shall be transmitted to the other House; if concurred in by the said House, it shall become a law. And all deliberations and action of either House on legislative business shall be in open session, and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both."

MISSIONARY BISHOP'S REPORT.

The SECRETARY presented the triennial report of the Missionary Bishop of China and Japan, which was referred to the Committee on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.

CONSTRUCTION OF RULES.

The PRESIDENT. I wish to state to the House that it will take us a little while to get into working order under the new rules. A while ago I was under the impression, as stated by one gentleman in contradiction of another, that this order of business prescribed in the fifth rule formed an order of the day that took precedence of the order mentioned in the seventh rule. Having thought the matter over, I came to a different conclusion; and, upon consultation with a gentleman near me who is well acquainted with the proceedings of other deliberative bodies, my second opinion was confirmed as without doubt. Therefore, under the seventh rule, at 12 o'clock each day, unless there is a special order of the day, the Calendar will be taken up. That is the present ruling of the Chair for our future action.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. In consultation with several members it has occurred to us that the difficulties and misapprehensions which undoubtedly exist would be removed if, before the words "order of the day," we should insert the word "special," so as to read: "Unless there be a special order of the day." That would obviate all misapprehension.

The PRESIDENT. The present ruling of the Chair will satisfy that doubt; and if it is thought wrong, of course the House will be able to decide.

The Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. If there is an order of the day, it will be of course special.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Under that ruling, are we to understand that the daily order of business should cease at twelve o'clock?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir; if there is no order of the day to take its place. This morning we have gone on because there was nothing on the Calendar. At twelve o'clock the special order will be taken up, or, if there be none, the Calendar will be proceeded with.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

The Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I submit the following resolution, to be referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be directed to consider and report upon the expediency of so amending Sections 2 and 3 of Canon 13, Title I, as to provide that the testimonials of Bishops-elect shall be sent to the several Diocesan Standing Committees and the several Bishops in all cases, instead of as now to the General Convention when within six months of the meeting of that body."

The object of this is to prevent the necessity of discussing the qualifications of any kind of Bishops-elect in this body. Now the Standing Committees and the Bishops separately pass upon the qualifications of Bishops-elect in five cases out of six. It is only when the election is within six months of the meeting of the General Convention that the testimonials are required to be brought before the General Convention. In all other cases the Standing Committees and the Bishops act. It seems to me it would be a decided improvement to have them in this case also go to the Standing Committees and the Bishops, and that the testimonials of a Bishop-elect should never be brought into this House for their consideration. That is the object of my resolution. I move to refer it to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

POINTING OF THE PSALTER.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Standing Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book be authorized and instructed to introduce into all future editions of the Standard Prayer-Book the colon or musical pause in each verse of the Psalter, and Canticles, in accordance with the pointing of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England."

THE HYMNAL.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I believe a resolution was offered a while ago by a gentleman from Georgia, that a special joint committee be appointed to examine into the publication of the Hymnal. I have here documents from the Diocese of Louisiana regarding the examination of the Hymnal, which I desire to have accepted by the House and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will receive the papers.

Rev. Dr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. They need not be read. They are very long, and, I think, will assist the Committee in arriving at a conclusion. I move that they be referred to the Joint Special Committee on the Hymnal.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. KNICKERBACKER, of Minnesota, submitted the following proposed Canon, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

"On the Presiding Bishop.

"Sec. 1. The senior Bishop of the Church, on becoming the Presiding Bishop, or at any time thereafter, may resign the jurisdiction of his Diocese, by issuing a notice to that effect to all the Bishops and Standing Committees of the Church. In the event of his doing so, his salary for the remainder of his life shall be provided for by the general Church, in the way hereinafter named.

"Sec. 2. When the Presiding Bishop shall have resigned the jurisdiction of his Diocese, it shall be the duty of the Treasurer of the General Convention to assess and collect annually from each Diocese of the Church a sum equal to one dollar for every clergyman canonically connected therewith, and pay over the same in quarterly instalments to the Presiding Bishop as his salary. The said assessment shall commence from the first of January preceding the resignation of his jurisdiction by the Presiding Bishop who shall first avail himself of the provisions of the Canon.

"Sec. 3. It shall be the duty of the Diocese over which the Presiding Bishop shall have had diocesan jurisdiction to provide a residence for him during the remainder of his life, and the said Diocese shall then be relieved of all other payment of his salary, except the annual compensation provided for in Section 2 of this Canon.

"Sec. 4. It shall be the duty of the General Convention at each Triennial Session to appoint a Board of Trustees of the fund for the support of the Presiding Bishop. The said board shall consist of five members, of whom the Treasurer of the General Convention *ex officio* shall be one. It shall be the duty of such board to collect, invest, and manage an endowment for the purpose, and to become duly incorporated for the objects of this Canon.

"Sec. 5. When the annual interest from such fund shall reach the sum of \$5,000, the interest of the fund shall be paid to the Presiding Bishop as his salary, and the assessments on the dioceses shall cease. The Trustees may, from time to time, apply the interest, if such there be, of such fund to the increase of the salary of the Presiding Bishop beyond what he receives from the Diocesan assessments, until the total sum paid him annually from both sources shall reach \$5,000. But no part of the principal of said fund shall be used for this purpose."

TIME OF ACTION OF BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. Mr. President, there is an article in the Constitution—Article III.—which limits the power of the Bishops to approve or disapprove any measure sent from this House to the period of three days. I think it will be evident to this House, upon a moment's thought, that while this act is a little discourteous to our Right Rev. Fathers, it subjects them to a condition which they are hardly able to comply with, considering the largeness of the business now before the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT. Allow me to suggest to the gentleman from Maryland that that matter has been referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution this morning.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. About leaving out the article?

The PRESIDENT. Changing the article.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. My resolution is:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to consider and report upon the propriety of striking out from Article III. of the Constitution all after the first sentence ending with the words, 'and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses.'"

The PRESIDENT. Dr. Stearns offered a resolution on that subject.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. If the House of Bishops adopts the same rule as this House, of taking up everything in order on the Calendar, it is easy to see that it cannot always within the period of three days send back a message to this House either approving or disapproving. If there were no other reason, I think we should refer the matter to our Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to consider the propriety of a change.

Besides I think there is an implied discourtesy on the part of this House to the other House, made up as it is at this time of so large a number representative of the wisdom, ability, and piety of this Church.

Then it will be seen that the last sentence is only of value as a historic monument, for it reads, "that until there shall be three or more Bishops as aforesaid, any Bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member *ex-officio*," etc. Of course that is wholly a matter of the past. The Bishops we do not expect ever to be reduced to a number so small as three.

I move the reference of this proposed change to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

THOMAS A. JOHNSON.

Mr. SMITH, of Western New York, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members.

"Resolved, That this House place upon its records the expression of its grateful sense of the eminent and long-continued service to the Church of the late Thomas A. Johnson, LL.D., a Lay Deputy from the Diocese of Western New York, taken to his rest since the last Convention."

CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. I present the following resolution of the Convention of the Diocese of Albany:

"Resolved, That the idea of a Constitutional Commission to consider the revival of our present General Constitution, as suggested by the Bishop of Western New York, and approved at this Convention by our own Bishop, is heartily welcomed by the Diocese of Albany; and our Deputies in General Convention are hereby instructed to use their best exertions to ensure its adoption by that body."

I move that it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

The PRESIDENT. It is with great pain that I announce that I have to make a change in the Committee on Canons on account of the absence of Dr. Haight. If Dr. Haight should recover sufficiently to attend in his place and to act on the Committee, the gentleman whom I now appoint will gladly give way for him. I name Dr. Beach, of the same denomination of the Diocese of New York, in place of Dr. Haight upon the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Of course,

sir, if Dr. Haight is able to be present at this Convention, and to serve on this Committee, I will at once retire.

PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I have been hoping that some older member of the House would introduce the subject-matter of the resolution I am about to offer; but as this seems the place for the introduction of subjects for consideration in our future deliberations, I now venture to introduce it:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to report upon the expediency of appointing a commission, to consist of members of both Houses, to devise a Provincial System for this Church."

The reason why I introduce this resolution is that at a late meeting of the Council of the Diocese of Minnesota its Clerical Deputies to this Convention were requested to urge upon the General Convention the devising of a provincial system. As I said, I have been hoping that some older member of the House would be prepared with a resolution at this time, or with some concrete proposition; but in order to introduce the matter, simply that it may be thrown into proper shape, I venture to offer the resolution.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDENT. A resolution was adopted a while ago to sit until two o'clock to-day. The time has come, however, when by another resolution of the House we take a recess, and there will be no time to come back and have a session at two o'clock. I therefore suggest that an adjournment be now moved, if there be no further business to be presented.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House adjourned till Monday, at ten o'clock A.M.

FIFTH DAY.

MONDAY, October 12.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at 10 A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. Joseph A. Stone, of Delaware. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. William Fulton, D.D., of Easton. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. Samuel Allen McCoskry, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Michigan.

The minutes of the proceedings of Saturday last were read and approved.

DEPUTIES FROM NIOBRARA.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I hold in my hand a paper of such unusual interest, so unique in its character, that, after its reading by the Secretary, I will ask leave to make a few explanatory remarks.

The Secretary read as follows:

"HOUSE OF BISHOPS,

"October 10, 1874.

"I hereby certify that at a meeting of the Convention of Niobrara, August 28th, 29th, and 30th, the Rev. Samuel D. Hinman was elected a Clerical Deputy, and Henry Whipple Waumdixun Lay Deputy to the Assembly in New York, October 7th.

"WILLIAM H. HARE,

"Missionary Bishop of Niobrara."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this paper was entrusted to me as chairman of a

committee of this House on Indian Affairs ; and the occasion is one so peculiar that I think a few explanatory remarks should be made.

The missionary jurisdiction of Niobrara may not be mapped out in the minds of those who are here as clearly as it is in the minds of those of us who have visited it. It lies on the west bank of the Missouri River, north of Nebraska, up to the forty-sixth parallel, extending out to Wyoming Territory, and including most of the Black Hills, a country somewhat noted just now. It includes also the adjoining Indian reservations on the east bank of the Missouri River, and one in Nebraska, a few miles from the large Indian territory in Dakota, to which I have referred.

Now, for the first time in the history of our Church, a full-blooded Indian is to be introduced to our sittings, and indeed he has already been introduced. He is a full-blooded Dakota, usually called Sioux. The Dakota nation is divided into about fourteen tribes. This man belongs to what is usually known as the Santee Sioux tribe. Until the year 1862 it was located in Minnesota, and for a long while it was thoroughly peaceable. When they were dispossessed of most of their land, and otherwise fearfully abused, they were stirred up to actual hostilities. In the year 1862 about one thousand whites were massacred by these Santees. They were then removed to the Missouri River, and at last settled in Nebraska on the reservation where they now live. This man was a warrior at that time, a heathen, and not only a warrior, but a conjurer, practising this peculiar art. He belonged to the band of Wabashaw, the principal chief of the Santee Sioux. Soon after he went to the Missouri, he became a Christian man, and for eleven years he has been as consistent, humble, and devoted a Christian (his enemies being his judges, as well as his friends) as can be found in any part of the country. He is an active, zealous Christian. I have seen him time and again on his own reservation, and have heard the testimony of the white men round about him, as well as that of his own people. Henry Waumdixun is the best farmer on that reservation. He is warden of a church built by a lady of New York. His nephew, Paul Mazakute, was his minister. Very many of you have read the "Testimony to the Love of Jesus," by the Rev. Paul Mazakute. Those who have not may have that privilege by accepting a copy. It was published by the Indian Missionary Commission.

This man now comes among us from a band of Indians, whom I believe to be, in point of intelligence, industry, and morality, equal to any number of settlers who can be found in the same space in any part of this country. Carpenters leave out their tools without putting them up at night. Houses are unlocked, and people sleep there with a feeling of perfect security. I never felt safer in any part of the world than when sleeping among these Indians without any protection. They have a small police force of their own—no military near them—and that police force is quite capable of controlling the entire reservation. Their worship is most reverent ; and of all Christian men I think Paul Mazakute and the two Deacons, who are also dead, were as high types of humble, simple, faithful men of Christ as we are likely ever to meet with. I am sure it must give us all pleasure to receive, for the first time, one of the aborigines of the land.

What privileges you, Mr. President, may grant I have no means of knowing, for under our present rules delegates from the various missionary jurisdictions have no right to speak, save only on special subjects, after a special invitation.

Gov. Stevenson is on the same Committee with me. I tried to induce him to introduce this Indian ;

and I hope, sir, you will allow him the privilege of saying a few words.

I do feel it to be a privilege to introduce to this Convention a full-blooded Indian, giving him all the advantages that we at the last session allowed to Deputies from the various missionary jurisdictions. I hardly know of any like occurrence, save when at the great Paschal Feast of the Jews, after a drought by reason of the sins of that people, a few ears of early ripe corn were offered before the Lord as an earnest that the great harvest was ready. I have just such a privilege in introducing to this House this man as a type of all the Indians in this land ; for when they are properly reached by the Gospel, when they realize that Christianity is something more than words, they seem ready to yield their hearts to its influence and become as earnest and devoted Christians.

The PRESIDENT. Does Governor Stevenson wish to address the House ?

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Mr. President, I concur with the Deputy from Pennsylvania, that the admission of a native Indian as a Deputy in the General Convention of the Episcopal Church is an epoch in its progress. It ought to be a proud day for the assembled Church of America which witnesses the introduction of a red man as a Representative from a far distant jurisdiction in this body of Christ.

But there is another aspect in which it gladdens my heart, and in which I am sure it ought to gladden the heart of every Bishop and every Clerical and Lay Deputy in this body. It teaches a practical lesson of the success of this blessed Church of ours as a great missionary agency in spreading the Gospel of our Saviour. We have heard that the Episcopal Church was too restrictive and too contracted to be a missionary, that that great labor was for the Puritan. But, sir, when we look around us and see that the Episcopal Church has already eight missions actively engaged in bringing these savages to the cross of Christ, when we see by the report on the Domestic Missions what they have done towards evangelizing the Indians, and when we ourselves see an Indian himself to-day who comes with his credentials not only as a Christian, but as a Deputy, it stamps under foot the falsehood that the Episcopal Church is not a great missionary agency, as it ought to be, in saving the souls of men. And if I were to go back and indulge in fancy, and refer to that memorable period of 1607, when the first landing took place at Jamestown, in Virginia, when the Indians held all this vast domain, and turn to the traditional incident of Pocahontas and John Smith, and reflect that the Indians had been driven to the farthest frontier, it is a blessed thought for the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, even if our people have taken their lands and done them great injustice, that she has at a later day become an active agency in bringing them home to Christ. [Applause.] I have had, sir, some little experience—

The PRESIDENT. Will the gentleman from Kentucky pause a moment ? There have been a good many breaches of order in this House since the commencement of our session unknown before in the Convention, meeting as it does in a consecrated Church—I mean the yielding to the impulse to applaud. It is perhaps somewhat difficult to resist that impulse sometimes, but I think that the right feeling of the members of this Convention, and of every member of the Church, will assure all here that it is necessary, proper, and reverential that that impulse should in all cases be resisted, and that there should be no repetition of that which is certainly improper in the house of God, because if you can applaud you have the same right to exhibit dissent, and then we should have a Babel. The

gentleman from Kentucky will now please resume his remarks.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I was just about concluding what I had to say. If this body could know, as it has become my official duty to know as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate of the United States, the interest which the missionary labors and efforts of this Church are awakening among the red men, I am sure they would indulge in all the feelings of joyous satisfaction which I myself experience this day in the introduction of this Indian Deputy.

Sir, there is a peculiar aptitude in the Episcopal Church as a missionary. The Indian is not destitute of sense or of sagacity. I heard the venerable prelate from Minnesota say, many years ago, that he had often had Indians come to him and bear their voluntary testimony to the excellence of the Episcopal Church. He told me that an Indian once approached him and said: "Oh, I hear you pray to-day; I go to-morrow; I hear you pray the same prayer, and you must have one God. But when I go to other religious denominations, one pray one thing and another pray another thing; it is not the same prayer, and it cannot be the same God." This may be a homely illustration, but it touches my heart, and it seems to me to be excellent logic.

But the grand test of the missionary efforts of the Church is in their success. Take the White Earth Mission in Minnesota and see what has been done. I myself have received and read, from an admirable missionary minister, a native Indian, a letter which would almost bring tears from any man, praying to be delivered from the vices of the white men, who surround them there for the purpose of plunder or for the purposes of trade. Think of that, Mr. President! an Indian appealing to us to keep away the men who go there for the object of traffic, and by the use of liquors, and a resort to other vices, attempt to do away with the good which this Indian minister is achieving among his own people!

But, sir, I only rose to second the effort of my friend from Pennsylvania, and I close with a single thought. While I believe in most missionary efforts the people themselves ought to be made to contribute and to labor, and not to look abroad for charities, in order to create a spirit of self-reliance, it is different in regard to our Indians. They have not any means of self-reliance; they are literally the poor of that Gospel who, Christ says, must have the Gospel preached to them; and we must bear in mind, as I think, that this is an exception to the general rule; and while I would make all infant missions independent as soon as possible, and train them to exertion and self-reliance, yet in the case of the Indian we must put our hands in our pockets and encourage them in clothes, in books, in schools, in the building of churches. Let us do that, and my word for it, sir, the Episcopal Church will become one of the grandest missionary agencies that the nineteenth century has witnessed.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Mr. President and gentlemen of the House: It fell to my lot in the last Convention to urge most earnestly, strenuously, and, as it happened, successfully, the measure which admits Deputies from missionary jurisdictions to this floor. I consider it the best service I have ever rendered to the Church, and I shall truly rejoice to welcome our colored brother in the sessions of this body.

I rejoice, also, for another reason, affecting deeply the character not only of this Convention, but of the whole country. For a century, at least, the United States has been under the execration of the civilized world for its gross misconduct to the aborigines of this country. It has been rebuked in all

the languages of Europe for its cruelty and inhumanity to these tribes, and we have richly deserved it. The great De Tocqueville, in one of the most delicate sarcasms in his book, speaking of the various contrivances by which, by fraud and rapine and improper laws, the Indian race was being extinguished, ruined, and annihilated under the forms of law, observes that never were the aborigines of a whole continent exterminated and extirpated with a stricter regard for the laws of humanity! That was the sneer of the great French writer. I am in hopes, sir, the time has come when we shall wash out that blot and efface that stain from our national escutcheon; and I hold, sir, that we are doing it most effectually by the action of to-day. The admission of this red Deputy may be cited by this Church as an evidence that we intend to do justice and repair the wrongs of these much injured aborigines.

The PRESIDENT. I think it quite proper that this Indian Deputy should be allowed by the House to make some acknowledgment of the courtesy which has been extended to him in the remarks which you have heard, but it requires a motion to that effect.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I make the motion that he be allowed the privilege.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The Deputy will present himself before the House.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Rev. Mr. Hinman will translate for him.

Mr. HENRY WHIPPLE WAUMDIXUN addressed the House in his native tongue (his words being translated by Rev. S. D. Hinman sentence by sentence). When I heard the words the Church brought to us in our far-off land, although I heard them for several years, I never expected to be a member of such an assembly as this. It seems to me that the Great Spirit has spoken to me of his own will, not of my desire, and I have been sent here as a member of this body to represent our Indian people, and I am very thankful for it.

In our country we are very poor, and we never thought that a great Church like this would turn and look upon us; and even after we had heard the words that the Church brought us, we never thought that we would be honored and lifted up to be made members of an assembly like this.

My friends, I was weak and had fallen down, but your aid lifted me up and caused me to rise. To-day I know that to be true in my heart.

When I return home and tell my people how I have been received here, and what I have heard, and what I have seen, they will be all very glad, and you will make the whole Church among the Indian people much prouder for the kind words you have given me to-day.

My friends, I have walked for years in darkness, without any light, but through the Gospel which has been given to you, which you have given to us, I have begun to see the light, and now it seems that God has made me to walk in high places, and to-day I have a very great joy. I am very thankful.

This is all I have to say. My friends, I shake hands with all of you.

COMMITTEE ON HYMNAL.

The following message (No. 7) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the resolution of the House of Deputies communicated to it in Message No. 5 from that House relative to the appointment of a special committee on the Hymnal, for the reason that the report of

the Joint Committee of the last General Convention upon the Hymnal has not yet been laid before the Convention."

DROPPED CANONS.

The following message (No. 8) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That Canons 8 and 9 of Title I of the Digest of 1868 be printed in the Digest; and, further, that Canon 8 of Title I of 1868 be numbered Canon 12 of Title I; that Canon 9 of Title I of 1868 be numbered Canon 11 of Title I; and that the remaining Canons of Title I be numbered in accordance with these provisions."

MISSIONARY JURISDICTIONS STANDING COMMITTEES.

Message No. 9, from the House of Bishops, announced the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That Clause 6 of Section 7 of Canon 13, Title 7, be amended, to read as follows:

"(6) Every such Bishop shall yearly appoint two presbyters and two laymen, communicants of this Church, resident within his missionary jurisdiction, to perform the duties of a standing committee for such jurisdiction, who shall continue in office till their successors be appointed. Provided, That no standing committee constituted under this section shall have power to give or refuse assent to the consecration of a Bishop."

DIVISION OF MICHIGAN.

Message No. 10, from the House of Bishops, informed the House of Deputies that it had adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That this Convention hereby consents to and ratifies the formation of a new Diocese within the limits of the Diocese of Michigan, to be composed of the counties of Branch, St. Joseph, Cass, Berrien, Van Buren, Kalamazoo, Calhoun, Eaton, Barry, Ottawa, Kent, Allegan, Ionia, Montcalm, Muskegon, Oceano, Newaygo, Meconta, Isabella, Clare, Osceola, Lake, Mason, Manistee, Wexford, Missaukee, Kalcaska, Grand Traverse, Benzie, Leelenaw, Antrim, Charlevoix, and Emmett."

NEW DIOCESE IN OHIO.

Message No. 11, from the House of Bishops, announced the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That this Convention hereby consents to and ratifies the formation of a new Diocese within the limits of the Diocese of Ohio, to be composed of that portion of the present Diocese lying south of a line running along the south line of Mercer, Shelby, Logan, Union, Marion, Morrow, Knox, Coshocton, Tuscarora, Harrison, and Jefferson Counties."

NEW DIOCESE IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. PERCE, of Michigan. Mr. President, as pertinent to Message No. 10 from the House of Bishops and germane to the subject, I hold in my hand some papers pertaining to the organization of a new diocese in Michigan, together with a resolution, which I ask to have acted on, in order that the matter may be forwarded with all due despatch:

"Resolved, That Message No. 10, of the House of Bishops, just received, together with the official consent of the Bishop of Michigan to a division of said Diocese, the official action of the Michigan Diocesan Convention with reference thereto, a list of presbyters in the proposed new Diocese, the

number of presbyters in the old Diocese, a list of self-supporting parishes, the exact boundaries of the new Diocese, and the statements of the provisions made for the Episcopal fund, now here presented to this Convention, be referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT. In reference to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, the Lay Deputy from New York [Mr. Ruggles], who is on the Committee, desires to resign his place. Will the House permit him to resign?

No objection being made, Mr. Ruggles was excused from service, and Mr. George W. Jackson, of Texas, was appointed upon the Committee in place of Mr. Ruggles.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Will the President please state the reason of my resignation?

The PRESIDENT. The reason was that Mr. Ruggles had too much to do on other Committees to attend to this.

DECEASED MEMBERS.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. On the part of the Chairman of the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members, I will take this opportunity to request that if there are any resolutions, or any information or tributes of respect to former members of this Convention, deceased since the last General Convention, gentlemen would be pleased to hand them to the Chairman of the Committee, Rev. Dr. Burgess, or to-day, in his absence, to me or any other member of the Committee. The object of this Committee, as we understand, was to save time, to digest any resolutions that might be offered or information presented, and also to prevent any omissions in the necrology of this body.

CANONS AS TO PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Rev. Mr. HARRIS, of Louisiana. I have here a preamble and resolution, which I desire to be referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Whereas, The law of this Church is threefold, embraced, first, in its Constitution, which is its organic law; second, in the Book of Common Prayer, which contains its ritual law; and third, in its Canons, which regulate and determine such matters as are not provided for in the organic and ritual law aforementioned; and whereas the sole law governing the public worship of this Church, or, in other words, its sole ritual law, is contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and particularly in the Rubrics of the same; and whereas, any Canon of Ritual prescribing or enacting what may or may not be done in the performance of public worship would constitute a part of the law governing the public worship of this Church, and would therefore necessarily be in effect an alteration or addition to the Church's ritual law contained in the Book of Common Prayer; and whereas, the Constitution of this Church provides that no such alteration or addition shall be made except in the manner therein prescribed. Therefore,

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to consider and report whether any Canon prescribing what may or may not be done in the performance of public worship can be enacted by this Convention without violating the spirit, at least, of the Constitution, Article VIII, of which provides that no alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer or other offices of the Church, or the Articles of Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one Convention and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at a subsequent General Convention."

The preamble and resolution, I believe, explain themselves. I have no desire to make any remarks concerning them, but will ask that they be read by the Secretary, and then referred to the Committee on Canons.

The preamble and resolution were read and referred to the Committee on Canons.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I hold in my hand a petition of five hundred and one clergymen of the Church asking for a modification of two Rubrics in the Service for the Baptism of Infants—the alteration of the word “shall” after “may” in one case, and the alteration of a Rubric so as to allow of an alternate prayer in another case. I move the reference of this petition to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Ought it not to go to the Committee on the Prayer-Book?

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I say the Committee on Canons, not the Committee on the Prayer-Book; for this is a question of law; it is not a question touching the genuineness of the text at all.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the petition to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

USE OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

The Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. It will be remembered by some of the Deputies who were members of this House at the last General Convention, that this body passed a Canon entitled “Canon 20, Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer,” designed to afford the clergy of the Church the liberty of using under certain circumstances shortened forms of prayers. This Canon, however, the House of Bishops did not concur in, and the matter was not brought up again in this body at its last session. Since that time, however, the Church of England has acted upon this subject. The Convocations of Canterbury and York have passed a law authorizing the clergy under certain circumstances to use shortened services, and the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain has given its sanction to this action of the Convocations; and therefore there is now in England full liberty under certain prescribed circumstances for using shortened services. Some months ago, the Rev. Dr. Haight, who took great interest in the matter, prepared a proposed Canon on this same subject, and sent copies of it to some of his intimate friends whom he supposed to be interested in liturgical subjects. In his absence, and for him, I beg leave to present a proposed Canon on the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and to move that it be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The Secretary read the proposed Canon, as follows:

Canon 20. Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer.

SEC. I. Every minister shall, on all occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church; and this rule shall be understood to prohibit all additions to, and omissions from, the prescribed order of said Book, except in the cases prescribed by Section 14 of Canon 13, Title I., and also except in so far as is hereafter in this Canon otherwise provided.

SEC. II. On any days other than Sunday, Christmas Day, Ash-Wednesday, Good-Friday, or Ascension Day, in lieu of the order for Morning Prayer or for Evening Prayer, as set forth in Book of Common Prayer, there be used a shortened form taken from such order.

SEC. III.—[1.] The shortened form of Morning Prayer shall consist of—

- One or more of the Sentences;
- The General Confession;
- The Declaration of Absolution;
- The Lord's Prayer, with the versicles following;
- One or more of the Psalms for the Day (or of the Selected Psalms);
- One of the Appointed Lessons;
- The Te Deum, or Benedicite, or Jubilate, or Benedictus;

The Apostles' (or Nicene) Creed, with the versicles following;

- The Collect for the Day;
- The Collects for Peace and for Grace;
- The Prayer of St. Chrysostom;
- “The Grace of our Lord,” etc.

[2.] On Wednesdays and Fridays—not being Christmas Day, Ash-Wednesday, or Good-Friday—the Litany may be read after the Collect for Grace in the shortened form, or it may be read on those days in lieu of this shortened form.

[3.] The shortened form of Evening Prayer shall consist in like manner of—

- One or more of the Sentences;
- The General Confession;
- The Declaration of Absolution;
- The Lord's Prayer, with the versicles following;
- One or more of the Psalms for the Day (or of the Selected Psalms);
- The Cantate, or Bonum Est, or Deus Misereatur, or Benedic Anima Mea;

The Apostles' (or Nicene) Creed, with the versicles following;

- The Collect for the Day;
- The Collects for Peace and Aid against Perils;
- The Prayer of St. Chrysostom;
- “The Grace of our Lord,” etc.

SEC. IV.—[1.] When in any church there have been, or during the day are to be used, the Order for Morning Prayer and for Evening Prayer, or the Shortened Forms of the same as herein provided, for days when such may be employed, with the Litany on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and on Sundays and Holy Days such part, at least, of the Holy Communion Office as is required to be read when there is no Communion, then may be said, as an ADDITIONAL SERVICE, at any hour of the day.

- The Litany;
- Or, an additional form consisting of,
 - The Lord's Prayer, with the versicles following;
 - A Psalm from the Psalter;
 - A Lesson from Holy Scripture;
 - One of the Canticles from the Book of Common Prayer; or, an anthem from Holy Scripture;
- The Apostles' (or Nicene) Creed, with the versicles following;

- The Collects for Peace and Grace, from the Order, for Morning Prayer, if in the morning.

- The Collects for Peace and for Aid against Perils, from the Order for Evening Prayer, if in the evening.

- A Collect or Collects from the Book of Common Prayer;

- “The Grace of our Lord,” etc.

[2.] The Minister using such Shortened Forms as in this Canon is provided may, at his discretion, insert in its proper place any portion of the Order for Morning Prayer, or for Evening Prayer, herein authorized to be omitted; and in like manner with the Additional Form.

[3.] The Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Holy Communion may be used together, or in varying order, as separate services; or the Litany may be said after the Prayer for the President of the United States in the Order for Evening Prayer, or after the Collect for Aid

against Perils, in the shortened form of the same, in lieu of or in addition to its use with the Morning Prayer.

[4.] In the shortened form of Morning Prayer, or of Evening Prayer, the several portions into which Psalm cxix. is divided shall each, for the purposes of this Canon, be deemed to be a separate Psalm.

SEC. V.—[1.] A sermon or lecture may be preached without being of necessity preceded by the Order of Morning Prayer, or for Evening Prayer, or by any of the shortened or additional forms provided in this Canon; *Provided*, that there be first said a Collect or Collects from the Book of Common Prayer.

[2.] At mission services, missionary meetings, and the like, other forms of service, taken from the Book of Common Prayer, may be used, subject to the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese in which such service is held.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. I move, at this stage, in connection with the reference of that measure to the Committee, that there be printed 500 copies for the use of this House.

The PRESIDENT. I suppose that is proper.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. One more word of explanation. This proposed service is substantially, with the very slightest alteration, the one which has become a law in the Church of England, after passing through the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I am in accord with what has been said; but, as I understand, it is proposed to refer that to the Committee on Canons. Is that the motion?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. We have now a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. The question of reference is not debatable.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I am not debating it. We have a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. It strikes me that, before we refer to the Committee on Canons the expediency of adopting such a Canon as this, we should refer it to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to report to us whether we can act by Canon in directing what omissions shall be made out of the Prayer-Book in the usual services of the day. I therefore move as an amendment that it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I have had handed to me by a gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bennett] a resolution drawn up by him on the very subject:

“Resolved, That the Committee on the Constitution be directed to enquire and report whether the eighth article of the Constitution does not prohibit any alterations of the Book of Common Prayer, except in the mode therein prescribed, and whether a short or different form of prayer than those laid down can be authorized by a mere Canon of this Church.”

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the proposed Canon to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. But the amendment is to transfer it to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I would submit that the second motion will be in order immediately after we have acted on the previous motion. The previous motion was to refer the Canon proposed by the Deputy from New York to the Committee on Canons. That is the motion before the House. After we have adopted that, then this resolution will be in order referring the subject of the resolution to another committee.

The PRESIDENT. I understand Rev. Dr. Cady, of New York, to offer a proposed Canon to the House,

and move that it be referred to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. Then Mr. Livingston proposed to amend that motion by referring the subject to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. We have already had experience which shows that there is very great difficulty in having these two committees, a Committee on the Constitution and a Committee on Canons sitting separately. I simply suggest whether a great deal of this difficulty might not be removed by a change in the rule, so that the two committees may sit together as a joint Committee on Constitution and Canons. I do not make a motion; I only make a suggestion.

The PRESIDENT. As I understand the rule of the House in regard to these matters, the motion to amend by referring the proposed Canon to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution is now the question before the House. The resolution of Mr. Livingston cannot come in as an amendment.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. May I suggest whether it would be proper to have a document having mixed character and relations to the work of both these committees, referred to both committees. That would simplify the whole matter. Can we refer the same paper to two committees? If we can, I move an amendment to the motion to refer the proposed Canon to the Committees on Canons and the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. That is a new question, and the Chair would like to be informed upon it by some experienced parliamentarians.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. On behalf of the Committee on Amendments, I suggest that it ought to go to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. It is evident that both these subjects-matter should go first to the Committee on the Constitution, and we know that we shall have a great many other questions of the same sort. I therefore move that, whenever the Committees on Constitution and Canons choose, in their discretion they may sit as a Joint Committee. It will save us a great deal of trouble and much time. I offer that proposition as germane to the subject before us.

The PRESIDENT. It will not be in order until we dispose of this matter.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Then I move as an amendment that the subjects-matter be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I think the proposed Canon had better be referred to the Committee on Canons as the appropriate reference, and the resolution of enquiry simply whether a constitutional change is necessary may be referred to the other Committee. The Committee on the Constitution will pursue that enquiry of course immediately and report to the House, and if the report is in favor of canonical action, then the other Committee can go on with its work.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, I desire to say that if any of those matters be referred to the Committee on Canons, and if it discovers that the subject should go to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, it will, as it has already done during this session of the Convention, ask to be relieved from the consideration of the subject, and that it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I say this on behalf of the Committee on Canons.

A question was asked by the Chair a moment ago as to whether the identical same proposition could be moved by a reference to the Committee on Canons, and afterwards by a reference to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I will suggest,

in answer to the enquiry of the Chair, that according to the opinion I can give, that would be an unheard-of proceeding. The same subject must go to the one Committee or the other.

The PRESIDENT. The question then is on the amendment to refer the proposed Canon to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The amendment was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the original motion to refer the proposed Canon to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSIONARY JURISDICTIONS.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments to consider and report to this Convention whether any constitutional amendment is necessary to empower the General Convention of this Church to set off missionary territory from the territory of a Diocese, at the request of said Diocese, duly made known."

ALTERATION OF BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Constitution be directed to enquire and report whether the eighth article of the Constitution does not prohibit any alteration of the Book of Common Prayer, except in the mode therein prescribed, and whether a short or different form of prayer than those laid down can be authorized by a mere Canon of this Church."

LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I wish to offer the following preamble and resolutions:

"Whereas, In the address of the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, made to this House on the occasion of his formal presentation on the 9th inst., as well as in the addresses of the Most Rev. Metropolitan of Canada and the Bishops of Kingston and Quebec on the same occasion, reference was made to the probable reassembling of the Lambeth Conference at an early date, including an intimation that an expression of the sentiments of this Church upon the subject might facilitate the convening of a second session of this Conference. Therefore,

"Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies respectfully submit for the consideration of the House of Bishops its cordial approbation in any measure that may be proposed by the Church of England for the reassembling of the Lambeth Conference in a second session."

"Resolved, That the foregoing preamble and resolution be communicated to the House of Bishops as a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies."

I will merely say, Mr. President, that this proposition is offered as one of courtesy. Some expression of sentiment in this regard has been invited by the Bishop of Lichfield as well as by the Canadian deputation; and I have at the request of a number of the Bishops prepared the resolution and offered it, regarding it as only one of courtesy. It commits us to nothing. It is only a polite response to their suggestion; and, of course, it is merely paving the way for the extension of an invitation to this Church which they desire to extend if they only know that it will be agreeably received.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I do not know that I shall really object to the resolution, but in order that the House may have time under its rules to

consider it, I tender my objection now, so that it may lie over and come up on the Calendar of business to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT. The time for entering upon the Calendar, which is the order of the day, has passed, and no other business can be entertained until that is disposed of without a vote of two-thirds of the House. I will mention to the House, however, that the only thing upon the Calendar is one which the House on Saturday informally determined should not be taken up to-day. We can now take it up and pass it over, or make any disposition of it that is deemed proper.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I will only say that this matter which I have presented requires a little speed, inasmuch as those to whom reference is made in the resolution are about leaving, and the message has to go to the House of Bishops. The Canadian Metropolitan leaves to-morrow, and the Lord Bishop of Lichfield leaves on Wednesday. The matter ought to be attended to at once.

BISHOPS-ELECT OF ILLINOIS AND WISCONSIN.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The first business on the Calendar is the resolutions reported by the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops, respecting the signing of the testimonials of the Bishops-elect of Wisconsin and Illinois.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice which I gave on Saturday, I now move that this subject be made the special order of business to-morrow morning immediately after Divine service.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Does not that require a two-thirds vote? It is varying the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. It comes in before the reading of the minutes, even.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move to amend by fixing Wednesday at eleven o'clock.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. My motion was that it be made the special order of business to-morrow morning, immediately after Divine services. The object, and the only object, of the proposition is this: I have been informed by many of my friends that the Convention is holding its sessions at what is now considered quite low down in the city, and at a great distance from the houses of those who visit it; and it would be desirable for them to know, through the morning papers, at what time this House is about to sit with closed doors, so that they will not have occasion to come at so early an hour. Further, those who do come here to attend Divine service will then retire from the House when Divine service is through, and when the Convention meets by itself after that no other persons will be admitted.

The object of my motion will not be accomplished if we enter at all upon the appropriate business of the Convention by reading the minutes in the presence of an audience here, because then it will be necessary after the reading of the minutes for us to wait until the persons in attendance shall retire. It was to avoid that very thing that I made the motion, so that all who retire from the house will retire at the close of Divine service, and we may enter upon our business at once. It may well be that then it may be considered desirable to take up the minutes first; but I do not wish that we shall enter upon the business of the Convention proper after Divine service with the house full of people, and then at the close of the reading of the minutes stop to clear them from the house. It was just that circumstance that I wished to avoid.

As to the question whether this requires a two-thirds vote, let me say a single word. A motion to make a thing a special order for a given time is one of those privileged motions named in our rules, as a motion to postpone to a time certain, and it is a motion that can always be made when a question is pending. A motion to postpone to a time certain is a motion to make a thing a special order for that time in effect; and a motion to make a thing a special order when it comes up for consideration, I believe, is uniformly acted upon by all parliamentary bodies by the simple vote of a majority of the House.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President, notwithstanding that motion may be made at any time, still if it varies the orders of the day it requires a vote of two-thirds to carry it; and now upon principle I hope that it will not be done. During this Convention and during the Conventions that will follow, there will be many occasions, I have no doubt many in this Convention, when this going into secret session must take place. We are a deliberative body, and we are to act for our own convenience; we are here to carry on the work of the Church as expeditiously as we can; and if we attempt to regard the convenience of the galleries and of the visitors, from time to time, rather than our own; if we attempt to say through the public papers, "to-day, and to-morrow, and next day," over this man, that, and the other, "on a certain day we will go into a certain hearing, and the public may not come," we are incommencing ourselves during the whole Convention—we are interrupting the wheels of our business in a way that we ought not for a moment to do. We have adopted the rule. I do not know that the rule is wise, but it is our rule, and let the public take notice of the fact, and govern themselves according to our rule and our convenience. When it is convenient to us to go into secret session, let us act as though the galleries had not a person in them, and the public was not known. We have taken this matter in our hands contrary to the opinions of the public, I am sure, and now we cannot—

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I rise to a point of order. I call attention to the eighth rule of order:

"The House shall proceed to the order of the day at twelve o'clock precisely, unless dispensed with by a vote of two-thirds of all the members present."

I submit that a motion to that effect must be made in order that the gentleman may be in order in his remarks.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I submit that I am right.

The PRESIDENT. I think we are upon the order of the day now, and this is a motion made in reference to it. It is not proposed to dispense with any rule of order, but we are proceeding under that rule of order.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. As I understand it, the matter before the Convention at twelve o'clock precisely was the report of the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, and that is before the House now.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Now, in order that we may discuss any other subject whatever, it must first be moved that the rule of order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT. We are discussing that point now.

The Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. As I understand, we are discussing a motion to postpone it until to-morrow, or to make it a special order for to-morrow. My point is that, in order to bring in such a motion as that, you must first dispense with the rule of order.

The Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. This is in effect a motion to do that very thing.

The PRESIDENT. I do not think so.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. A single word on the question of order. A thing is regularly called up on the Calendar, and the mistake of the gentleman is that we are necessarily bound to press it or reject it at that time. It simply comes before the House, and then any motion allowed by the rules may be made upon it, and those motions are, a motion to amend, a motion to commit, a motion to postpone indefinitely, a motion to postpone to a day certain; and each of those motions has precedence in the order named. This is one of those motions, being a motion to postpone to a time certain. We are not bound to pass it or reject it when it is reached on the Calendar; but we may make such disposition of it as the majority of the House please.

The PRESIDENT. I have determined that the gentleman's motion is in order, but there has been a motion to amend that by fixing Wednesday morning instead of Tuesday.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I accept the amendment.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I am speaking in regard to the matter before the House, which I believe is the matter for us now to consider once for all; are we in this instance to set the precedent of conforming our actions to the convenience of the public or to our own convenience? I hope that we shall never set any day certain to go into secret session on any business, especially when that business is now the general order of the day, for the purpose of allowing people to stay away from Divine service; but that we go into the consideration of this matter whenever it arises.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. I apprehend that we cannot set aside one of the most important rules of this House in the summary manner proposed by the Deputy from Western New York. Rule 5 reads as follows:

"The daily order of business shall be as follows:

"I.—Reading the Minutes.

"II.—Communications from the President.

"III.—Reports from Standing Committees, in the following order:

"1. On elections," etc.

The resolution of the honorable Deputy from Western New York proposes summarily that the order of the day for to-day at twelve o'clock shall be made the order of the day to-morrow before proceeding with the regular order of business as provided by this rule. I apprehend that the only way in which that could be accomplished would be by a resolution suspending the fifth rule of order, which requires a two-thirds vote. What the gentleman has said in regard to how questions shall be put, presupposes that the daily order of business shall have been accomplished. When the daily order of business has been accomplished, then a resolution to make a matter a special order for a given time is in order; but I apprehend that we cannot, until the daily order of business has been completed, take up any other question without suspending the fifth rule of order.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. It seems to me that there can be no sort of difficulty in a proper understanding of this question if Rules of Order No. 6 and No. 7 are read:

"6. The Secretary shall keep a Calendar of business, on which reports from committees, resolutions which lie over, and other matters undisposed of shall be placed in the order in which they are presented.

"7. At twelve o'clock, unless there be an order of

the day, or as soon thereafter as the order of the day shall be disposed of, the business on the Calendar."—

"This business:—

—"shall be taken up and disposed of, in the order in which it stands thereon; and a vote of two-thirds of the members present shall be required to take up any matter out of its order on the Calendar."

Now, this business stands on the Calendar as the order for to-day. It is called up pursuant to that order. The question is now on a motion to postpone its consideration; that is to say, that the House will not consider it in the order in which the rule provides that it shall be considered. That motion is perfectly in order, but it requires a two-thirds vote in accordance with the provisions of Rule 7. It is perfectly competent for the House to say, if it has the disposition so to say, that we will not consider the special order now before the House until to-morrow, or the next day, or any other day; but in order to do so it requires a two-thirds vote under your rule.

I fully concur with the sentiments expressed by the Clerical Deputy from Texas in reference to this matter. I believe that the House should consider its business in the order that it has provided for by its rules.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I should like to ask a question. As I apprehend the rules of order, the Deputy from Louisiana has made a mistake. If I understand the decision, the question now before us is the very resolution proposed by the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops. That is the business now before the House. What is the rule about that?

"When a question is under consideration"—

The question under consideration being now these very resolutions of the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops—

"no motion shall be received."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I rise to a question of order. I understand that the President has already decided that the motion to postpone until Wednesday is in order.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I respectfully submit that the Chair ought not to allow such a question to be again debated here.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I did not understand that to be the ruling of the Chair, or I would not have said a word.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The Chair has properly so decided.

The PRESIDENT. There is one question of doubt remaining in my mind, and that is, whether the motion as made to supersede the regular order of business before twelve o'clock requires a two-thirds vote, and I would ask the Deputy from Virginia to enlighten the mind of the Chair on that point.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. My own opinion about that is that the rule requiring the order of the day to come up at twelve o'clock presupposes the regular transaction of the business of the House up to that time, and I respectfully suggest to the gentleman from Western New York to content himself with a motion to make this the order of the day for Wednesday. It is a very little matter for us to consider about getting people out of the House after the religious services are over, and it does involve a vast deal of confusion if the special order of the day comes in to overslaugh everything in the regular order of business of the House.

The PRESIDENT. I hope the gentleman from Western New York will accept that suggestion. There will be but little time lost by it, for it will be near twelve o'clock before we get to work on Wednesday.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I

am not pertinacious in this matter, my object being only to promote the convenience of the body as well as of those outside; but I must say a word. I have just enquired of my distinguished friend on the left (Mr. Stevenson) as to the practice of the Senate. I know the practice of the deliberative bodies of which I have been a member has been that, when a matter is before the House in its regular order for consideration, its consideration can be fixed for any future time by a majority vote. We are now acting under the order of the day. We have reached twelve o'clock. We are still within that rule. We have taken up on the Calendar the matter of signing the testimonials of the Bishops. We are acting so far according to the order of the day. Now, I submit that the rule of parliamentary bodies is that that daily rule of order prescribed by the rules is always subject to a special order made on any day before that. I could not interfere with the regular order of the day, by proposing a special order to overrule it. That it was held on Saturday could not be done; but when on a preceding day, under the regular order of business, this House has fixed a special order for the opening of the House on a particular day, it does on that day take precedence of the common daily order. That is the daily practice of the Senate and the daily practice of all other parliamentary bodies. It is not suspending any rule; it is simply doing under the rules of the body what we have a right to do, and what the very rule as to calling the Calendar at twelve o'clock contemplates, and whether we have made a special order for twelve o'clock, or we have made a special order for ten o'clock, or half-past ten, makes no difference; the rule only settles that at that particular hour the Calendar shall have precedence if there be no special order. This may be very important when the daily order of business presents many matters for consideration. This House, for its own convenience, may say, "We should like to take this subject up to-morrow at eleven o'clock," or "at three o'clock;" and if we have not that power we cannot fix any matter for consideration at a time certain under our rules. I beg the gentleman from Virginia to reconsider the opinion he has expressed.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I did not say the House had not the power, but that the House ought not to exercise any such power.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I was not talking about what it was expedient to do. I understood the Chair to enquire of the very distinguished and learned gentleman from Virginia what the rule of law was, whether we could make a special order to-day by a majority vote which would supersede the common order of business for to-morrow, and I suppose he answered the question by saying that we could not. If the gentleman is of the contrary opinion, that we can legally, by a special order made to-day by a majority vote, supersede the regular daily order of to-morrow morning, I wish he would say so.

Now, sir, I will yield to the convenience of the House. When, at the suggestion of others, I agreed to Wednesday morning, it was assented to all around, I thought, that we should enter on this business with closed doors immediately on our meeting, rather than meet with open doors and then turn people out. I insist on my motion, if it be in order, that this business be made the special order for Wednesday morning, immediately after Divine service.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I move as an amendment that the House proceed forthwith to the discussion of the testimonials as presented.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I

raise the point of order that that will be the effect of voting down this motion.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I should like to have one good reason stated why we should postpone consideration until Wednesday. The Committee reported on Saturday last. I have not heard a reason stated for postponing, and I hope the House will vote down the motion.

Rev. Dr. CORBETT, of Illinois. I wish to state that there is one very strong reason for the proposed postponement, which I think will have due weight with this House—

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether my motion to proceed forthwith is before the House?

The PRESIDENT. I think not.

Rev. Dr. CORBETT, of Illinois. The statement which I wish to make is simply this. There are now on the way to this House, from the Diocese of Illinois, certain papers and memorials connected with the proposed confirmation of Dr. Seymour's election, which are prepared to state certain facts about that election, the consideration of which will, it seems to me, form a very necessary element in the discussion of the question by the House. I hold in my hand a telegram, and also a letter, stating the fact that these papers are now on the way to New York, and I respectfully ask that this fact be borne in mind by the House as offering a very important reason for postponement. These papers may be here to-morrow morning; they may not be here until Wednesday morning; but at any rate the very fact of their being on their way here is a reason sufficient, I think, for postponement.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. What is the question before the House, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. Postponing until Wednesday morning immediately after Divine service the consideration of the two reports of the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Allow me to ask the last speaker, through you, Mr. President, whether that time will be agreeable to him, or whether he asks a further delay?

Rev. Dr. CORBETT, of Illinois. I can only say in reply that that seems reasonable, for the documents were posted in the city of Chicago on Saturday, and therefore ought to be here to-morrow morning by the farthest. I should think Wednesday would be a sufficiently reasonable time to wait.

May I ask, before sitting down, in case the papers should not have arrived by Wednesday morning, will the fact of this postponement to Wednesday morning being decided upon preclude the possibility of their being put in?

The PRESIDENT. I should think not. The matter will be before the House at all times to dispose of, in their discretion, according to circumstances.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. There is a reason, I think, why this question should be postponed. There are several Deputies to my knowledge, men of experience and men of influence, who left here on Saturday, and who will not return until to-morrow. It occurs to me that, in a matter of such vast importance as this, in addition to the suggestion of the Deputy last up, every member of this Convention ought to know at least a day in advance when the subject will be taken up, so that if he is within a day's journey from here he can be here if he pleases. I hope the question will be postponed until Wednesday.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. This motion is to override our rules of order. I do not object to Wednesday or Thursday, or next week. I move to amend by inserting "at 12 o'clock on Wednesday,"

and then we do not override our rules of order or set any bad precedent for the action of this House.

The PRESIDENT. Although I am inclined to think a special order of the day can be made overriding the rules, conformably to the suggestion of the gentleman from Western New York, yet I would prefer having a day or two to consider that point; and as it is a fact that we shall hardly reach this business until a few minutes before twelve o'clock on Wednesday, that being, as all here are aware, a Litany day, I think it would be much better for us to make this business simply the order of the day for Wednesday.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I will name any hour the Chair wishes.

The PRESIDENT. Twelve o'clock will suit me; I merely wish to avoid deciding the other question *impromptu*.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. You will observe, Mr. President, that unless I make the motion before twelve o'clock, or at twelve, the Calendar will take its place.

The PRESIDENT. Let it be twelve, if you please.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I cheerfully acquiesce in the suggestion of the Chair, if it be the wish of the House to make this matter the special order for Wednesday, at twelve o'clock. That may, however, involve the removal of our friends from the galleries.

The PRESIDENT. No, sir, they will not come. It is moved to postpone the reports of the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops until Wednesday, at twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

BOARD OF MISSIONS NOMINATING COMMITTEE.

The PRESIDENT. The second order of the day is to proceed to ballot for a committee of three Clergymen and three Laymen to sit with a committee of the House of Bishops to nominate a Board of Missions.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I would nominate Rev. Dr. Burgess, of Massachusetts; Rev. Dr. Scarborough, of Pittsburgh; Rev. Dr. Locke, of Illinois; Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Cornwall, of Kentucky, and Mr. McWhorter, of Central New York.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I move that we dispense with the ballot, these names are so acceptable.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to dispense with the ballot, and these names be voted upon.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the election of the gentleman named as the Committee named to nominate the Board of Missions.

The gentlemen named were elected.

LAMETH CONFERENCE.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. Are resolutions in order?

The PRESIDENT. They are. The Calendar has been disposed of.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Then I call for the consideration of the resolution I offered a while ago.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, I interposed an objection to the resolution of my friend from Long Island. I desire now to withdraw it, having understood the object of the resolution.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I call for the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

"Whereas, In the address of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, made to this House on the occasion of his formal presentation on the 9th inst., as well as in the address of the Most Rev. the Metro-

politian of Canada and the Bishops of Kingston and Quebec upon the same occasion, reference was made to the probable reassembling of a Lambeth Conference at an early day, including an intimation that an expression of the sentiment of this Church upon the subject might possibly facilitate the convening of the second session of this Conference. Therefore,

"Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies respectfully submit for the consideration of the House of Bishops its cordial approbation in any measures that may be proposed by the Church of England for the reassembling of the Lambeth Conference in a second session.

"Resolved, That the foregoing preamble and resolution be communicated to the House of Bishops as a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies."

The PRESIDENT. Does the Deputy from Long Island wish to speak to the resolution?

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. If there is to be any debate on the resolution, I should like to be heard; but I hope it will not elicit any debate. I presume there is no occasion for discussion; the matter is plain; it is readily understood by the House.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I confess that I rise with diffidence to express the opinions I am about to express on what I deem a very important subject, if a farce can be deemed to have importance. This is to be a repetition of a scene which took place in 1807, I think, on the invitation of the late Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in the Colonies and the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, or who were in any way connected with it, in these United States. Now, mark, by this invitation—it was nothing but a polite invitation of one gentleman—the Church of England as a Church had nothing to do with it—gentlemen here in America were called to travel, some three thousand, many three thousand five hundred or four thousand miles, to go and visit the late Archbishop of Canterbury. It was said to be for a conference, but only four days were the period appointed for that conference. It was a mere invitation to a Canterbury tea-party, nothing else; and then what was the consequence? These gentlemen go there—I thank God that my Bishop had too much sense to go—they go there, and what is the result? They go there full of this then recent affair in the British Colonies, the Colenso business, and they find that by a private arrangement made by the Archbishop of Canterbury nothing of the kind can be entertained; and after politely waiving what I would deem their rights in the matter, the four days were soon expended, of course, as much of our time is expended, in preliminary discussions, and at the expiration of that time what have they done? What could they do? The Church of England dare not move in a matter of that kind unless assured that the state will back her in what she does. Thank God, we belong to a Church that does not ask toleration from the state, but protection, and we ask nothing else; and we say, when the state does attempt to put its hands on the Ark of God which is committed to our protection, "Stand off, stand off!" "*Procul este, profani!*"

Now, sir, we are asked to affirm to the Bishops that we are ready to consent to another farce of that kind, for it was nothing but a farce, and a farce which ended in something very tragical. When these Right Reverend Fathers gathered from Australia, from America, and from the little dominion of England (little compared with the dimensions of this dominion of ours in the United States), what was the result? After the four

days' conference they came to the conclusion to separate in the best humor possible, and proposed—I do not know but that the proposition came from him who was at that time the presiding Bishop of our Church—that the Bishops should have their final meeting in Westminster Abbey. What was the result? A priest, who forsooth had the authority of the Dean there, said, "No, gentlemen," to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in the world—"No, gentlemen, you shall not go there"—that very man who admits to the Holy Communion with other good men (and I trust he might have been a good man, though a very erroneous one) a Socinian afterwards. Gentlemen, are we going in any way to countenance this?

Let me tell you further that the right reverend gentleman who has taken so strong an interest in this subject has made a proposition, and the proposition is that we should become one great province, if you please, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as Metropolitan of these United States for the nonce, and that in all these conferences the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the great Metropolitan or Patriarch, is to preside. Gentlemen, are we, who know that the English Church did not dare to give us a Bishop until they got the consent of Parliament,—are we prepared to take a man appointed under a *congé d'élire*, a permission to elect, but at the same time assuring "them if you do not elect you have got to take the other alternative, and we will oust you and send you to the Tower,"—are we to put this free Church in the hands of or with a person thus appointed at the head? I say there is no parity in the case. I say there is no respectability in the case. I say what is more, that you can not do a thing that will injure this Church more in the estimation of this Republic than such a movement as that. God forbid that I should ever forget what the Church of England in her society did for this country. God forbid that I should forget what the sovereignty of England in days past in our colonial period did. But I never can forget that again and again the Church in the country petitioned for perfection, "Send us a Bishop." We had to send our candidates 3,000 miles, and two-thirds of them, or one-half at least, died before they came back with permission to officiate; and why did that Church refuse? Simply because the timid state was afraid of sectarianism here, and that they would injure themselves and their government at home if they made the Church here perfect.

I know that many are wont to call the Church of England the Mother Church. I hold that she is not. If so, I claim her to be nothing but a very poor stepmother. The Church in this country never was perfected till she got her perfection by the consecration of Seabury from the Bishops of Scotland, and if we acknowledge a mother other than the Mother Church of Jerusalem (which I am not prepared to acknowledge), we must acknowledge Scotland, not England.

I could say a great deal more on this subject; full of it I am; but, under the circumstances, I think I have said enough to satisfy the members of this House that they had better let it alone, and wait till the Bishops tell us what they think of it. They are the persons interested. They accepted the first invitation without asking us "with your leave" or "by your leave." Now, after they have been bluffed, and this Church, I would say, insulted as it has been by the Dean of Canterbury, and by the prearrangement of keeping out the very question which these gentlemen, at a large expense of time and money, went to attend to, why not leave them first to express their opinion? My word for it, from what I know of the self-respect of the members of

that House, if you wait for that you will wait to the end of the term.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Mr. President, I had no conception that the venerable Deputy from Connecticut entertained such feelings of animosity.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I do not, sir. I have shown no feeling of animosity, but simply of self-respect.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I may be permitted, Mr. President, to choose my own words. I say I had no idea that the gentleman had such feelings of animosity toward the Church of England, or toward those fifteen or twenty (I forget how many) venerable Bishops of our Church who went across the water to the Pan-Anglican Conference, as it was called, of 1867. I cannot disguise my astonishment at *tantæne animis celestibus ire*. Knowing him in other and such very general relations, and knowing his loyalty to the Church, and knowing how ready he is to stand up not only for this particular branch of it but for the Church catholic, I must say that I am quite overwhelmed. When I was asked if I had any remarks to make concerning this resolution, I said no, because I supposed it would not elicit debate. An objection that was to be taken having been withdrawn by the distinguished Deputy from Virginia upon a clearer apprehension of the terms, as I supposed, of the preamble and resolution, I took for granted that the way was clear for a unanimous passage, for I had made enquiries in the House in various quarters concerning it. I had intended offering it on Saturday, but I deferred it that I might get at what I supposed to be a fair expression of the average sentiment of the House on the subject. But now, after this warm and very cogent speech—for the distinguished Clerical Deputy from Connecticut always speaks cogently and generally with a great deal of warmth—I feel that it is necessary to say something in defence of the resolution.

The Bishops who went out to the Conference of 1867 had no opportunity of being advised by this House before they went, and therefore the argument in that regard falls to the ground. Furthermore, let me say that the House of Bishops regard it as a delicate matter for them to propose to this House that they shall of their own action elect themselves to be members of a distant conference without some suggestion on the part of this House; and therefore the Clerical Deputy was perfectly right when he said that if we waited for the action of the House of Bishops we should wait for ever. They will certainly never take that action.

I do not propose entering into a labored defence of the Conference of the Anglican Bishops in 1867. I was there at the time, and I was present at the opening religious services of that Conference. I was in daily communication with the deputation of American Bishops. I know perfectly well that during that time there was a degree of enthusiasm on the part of the Bishops of the American Church representing different phases of churchmanship. I remember very well the distinguished Prelate who was then our Presiding Bishop, and the late Bishop of Ohio, saying to me time and again that they felt that that Conference was designed to remove misunderstandings, to promote perfect sympathy throughout the different branches of the Church, to root more firmly the conservative sentiment of the Church throughout the world and make it more completely one; that they felt that the interchange of sentiments and feelings there would have a tendency to banish from the Church what has been called the madness of extremes. I know that, though that Conference did not meet the

wishes of those who expected special legislation, for it was not in the power of that Conference to take any legislative action. As the Deputy from Connecticut has already said, they had no such power. It was purely a voluntary gathering together, precisely as this will be, not for the promulgation of *dicta* or dogma, but for the simple purpose of conferring concerning the interests of Christ in the several jurisdictions represented by the Bishops who come together for that purpose—simply that, Mr. President, and nothing more.

There is no proposition made, and there is no idea entertained of any such office or proposed office as that of the Archbishop of Canterbury assuming towards the Church in this country the relation of a Metropolitan to a Province, or his becoming the Patriarch of the Anglican Church, or any views such as we know have been entertained by Utopian dreamers in ecclesiasticism at various times and in different parts of the Church—nothing of the sort. It is simply a conference that comes together under the call of Him whom we recognize as the highest officer in our branch of the Christian Church, for the purpose of communing together upon the greatest interests of the Church, for the purpose of promoting those interests in every way—coming together that they may infuse into each other the same energetic spirit that they carry into their work in the different Dioceses, and in that blessed fusion enjoy not only the communion of saints but, at the same time, give fresh impetus to the Catholic idea, enlarge it, augment it, and give it more practical and universal adaptation.

I cannot say that I take any very great special personal interest in this matter. I prefer referring it to those who have wiser heads and who are more experienced than I. I can only say that I can see nothing detrimental possibly to grow out of such a Conference, and I can see a great deal that will be of advantage to the Church that will grow out of it.

The preamble and resolution, which I worded with the utmost care, Mr. President, you will find commit us to nothing, involve simply nothing but the expression of a polite sentiment. And when the Bishop of Lichfield, who is here as the guest of this Church and who preached the inaugural sermon of this Convention, states, as he did here on the 9th inst., that he regards the coming together of that Conference in London in 1867 as the most important event since the Reformation, I take it for granted that this Convention owes it, at least to the cause of consistency in inviting that distinguished prelate to come here, to give some little weight to the words that he speaks in reference to this matter. I do not know that I agree with him, but I am only speaking of the weight which I say properly attaches to the words that he speaks in this connection.

I ask only a formal expression of our opinion that we present it to the House of Bishops to consider any measure, to express their approbation to any measure that may be adopted in reference to that convening—probably my wording there, “by the Church of England,” is a mistake, and probably I ought to say, “by the Archbishop of Canterbury,” because the point made by the Clerical Deputy of Connecticut is correct that it is not done by the Church of England in its corporate capacity either as an Establishment or as a Church, but it is done at the call of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I shall therefore be very happy to amend my resolution by accepting his suggestion in that particular, in order to make it to be entirely according to the facts of the case.

But, sir, I feel that we are making entirely too much of a matter that, so far as we are concerned in this House, should be merely a matter of formality or a matter of courtesy. After all, this is not

the endorsement of this House of anything that is to be done hereafter. It is merely an expression of an opinion that if in the wisdom of the Bishops of the Church of England they see fit to call a conference of the Bishops representing not only the Church in England, but the Colonial Church in different parts of the world, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, we are disposed to receive any such proposition as that kindly—politely, if you choose. There is no action proposed that commits us to anything whatever. I therefore beg to deprecate, Mr. President, any violent discussion on this subject. I would not have said, as I intimated in the beginning, anything at all had it not been elicited and made necessary by the remarks of my distinguished friend the Clerical Deputy from Connecticut. I therefore would submit to the catholic feeling, to the evangelical sentiment, and to the hospitable ideas of this House under existing circumstances, that this resolution ought to pass without opposition.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. Mr. President, in all the deliberations of this House which have come under my observation, I have never felt so great surprise as that a resolution of this kind should be offered and urged as one of mere courtesy. Were it a mere question of delicate consideration, of hospitality, as the gentleman expresses it, I presume there is not one in this House who could for a moment hesitate in an anxious desire to express our warm gratitude to those who have come to us from the Mother Church, honored by every member of our Church, and I am sure by none more heartily than my honored friend from Connecticut.

But, sir, if it be a mere question as to whether the Bishops of this Church shall accept a social invitation, if such invitation in future may be tendered them, a meeting for social conference or for spiritual improvement, I submit that the strong language contained in this resolution is entirely out of place, and, moreover, that it is not the part of this Convention in advance, to express their warm approval of the Bishops accepting an invitation to a mere social entertainment. But, sir, if there is something more than this, which is in the future and connected with this Conference, then to pass upon the subject in so informal a manner—to treat as a mere matter of courtesy that which seems to aim at an organic change in all the relations of our Church to the Anglican Communion—is to me amazing.

Sir, the gentleman treats with great contempt the idea that there is anything more than a social entertainment or spiritual conference for the benefit of their Churches aimed at.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I beg pardon. I used no such language. I said nothing about this being a social entertainment; much less did I say that it was nothing more than a social entertainment.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. I understood the gentleman to have affirmed his conviction that there was nothing intended like new relations between this Church and the Church of England, and especially that no one seriously dreamed of recognizing the Archbishop of Canterbury as the Primate of the Anglican Communion. That I understood distinctly to be affirmed by the gentleman.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. Then surely we ought to hesitate before receiving his assurance in the face of all the many intimations which have come to other gentlemen in a great variety of forms that there was something more hoped for by those who are pushing forward these measures. Now, sir, if it be a mere matter of courtesy that our Bishops should meet their brother Bishops and confer

with them, I submit that the Diocese of each one of our Bishops is the only party competent to give advice and express approval, and if need be furnish the means. But if this be intended as the forerunner of some new legislative body which in the future shall give law to all the Anglican Communion, which shall interfere with the independence of the American Church, it seems to me the most momentous question which could be brought to our notice; and if there be any serious intention in this movement, or any serious aim in it, it appears to me it must come somewhat in this shape. I am sure that if our Church is to grow and prosper in the land, it must be as an independent Church, attached to all the sympathies, thoughts, and institutions of the American people. And, considering how little we know with certainty of the last Lambeth Conference, how chary they were of informing the public as to what they said and what they did, it can scarcely be claimed that we are called upon in advance to express our cordial approval of our Bishops accepting an invitation, if perchance they may receive it.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it strikes me that there could hardly be a proposition made to this House on any general subject so entirely gratuitous, at least in one aspect of it, and so suggestive of all pregnant mischief in another aspect of it. It is gratuitous, because we are not called upon to say a word on the subject, of the resolution means anything, it means that this House shall say to the Bishops: "We would like to have you go to England." We have no authority to take any such stand or utter any voice. Therefore it is gratuitous, and therefore not to be admitted. But touching the other view of the matter, as a mere demonstration of kindness, is it necessary that there should be a repetition of that interchange of visits of 1867? Let the Conference of Lambeth pass for what it may, the prospective meeting at Lambeth is not a Conference. All who have read the English papers, all who listened to the Bishop of Lichfield the other day, can understand perfectly well that the aim of this whole proceeding is to inaugurate an organized and grand synod of the whole English-speaking Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury to be its legitimate and recognized Primate. It is then an organic entity that is to be called into being by this action. Now let us look a moment at the bearings of that.

It is not a mere social gathering; it is not a festival outside, nor a festival of reason simply, but it is to come together to deliberate upon principles of Church doctrine, Church practice, Church interests in some shape or other; and inasmuch as the Church of England cannot legislate with authority without Parliament to help it, it can, nevertheless, when it gathers together in this imposing form, put forth its decrees with a certain aspect of authority. Now, suppose our Bishops go, not once, but remember the idea is to have it periodically. The Bishop of Lichfield told us the other day most emphatically how deeply his soul was in earnest in the matter, and for that purpose in great part did he come here to effectuate—what? Union; independence, indeed, but union. Organic union, that must mean.

Are we ready for organic union with the Church of England? Are we ready—I do not say to receive our laws from her, but we are ready to sit down in a state of receptiveness, and say to her highest authority in matters of doctrine, "Teach us; we will carry home these views to our Church at home, and no doubt they will be vastly influenced by the authority of this Synod." We are importing a sovereignty from abroad. Now, are we so far removed from our origin as a Church that we have forgotten how this Church had to fight

against, as its main opponent, the constant cry and charge, "You are Anglican, you are monarchical, there is nothing republican in you, there is nothing in you adapted at all to popular institutions"? Do we not know how the Fathers of the Church—all honor be to their memory—studiously aimed to adapt the institutions of this organism to those of our civil arrangements? And has it not been many a time a matter of admiration, and might I not say an argument by which we could at once overpower all manner of suggestion against the popularness of this institution of ours? We have proved that it was purely American, and many an elaborate sermon was preached in our early history to prove that the American Episcopal Church had no organic connection whatsoever with the Church of England. We say the same again and again; and now are we so clean demoted that we shall ourselves make overtures for the reproduction of that which well-nigh swamped us at the beginning, and will most assuredly overwhelm us with deserved reproach at the end? Why, can you carry this Church of ours? I am now supposing what is possible, and only possible, I will admit; but, if possible, a thing to be shunned, that possibility being this, namely: the returning influence of our Bishops from the grand Pan-Anglican Synod, and bringing with them in spite of themselves the remembrance and the reflection of that power born in that institute; they will bring it here and, whether consciously or unconsciously, they will diffuse it more or less. It will take an organic form; by and by that Synod will want to be heard here and it will want to be heard with authority, and then it becomes a recognized power. That is the point I am looking forward to. Let that come; when we go abroad in this great American Union, where liberal ideas, ideas of personal, and civil, and ecclesiastical freedom are as the very breath of life to the population, can we suppose that we can recommend our Church to strangers and outsiders when, on looking into us a little, they say, "Why, but you are connected with the Church of England; you are positively under the authority of a foreign ecclesiastical dominion; you are not American; we will none of you"? I am sure that every American heart here to-day must feel that this is a living likelihood; it cannot be escaped, and it would be fatal.

The only question whether all this is true or not depends on the possibility, the potentiality of it. I believe it to be wrapped up in this movement. The Bishops may go of their own free motion and make another visit to Lambeth, if their expenses can be paid, and they would enjoy the visit. There are no more university degrees for them to be ornamented with on their visit, but nevertheless they would, no doubt, enjoy the visit exceedingly; but oh! let it be a visit, let it be communion, if you please, to their hearts' content; communion not only at the same altar, but communion in the household, by the wayside, arm in arm, but never organic, integral union. God save this dear Church from any such combination as that, any entanglement of foreign and uncongenial alliances that would merge her prosperity before it is fully born.

The PRESIDENT. There is a standing order that the House shall take a recess at half-past one o'clock. That hour has arrived. The House now takes a recess to two o'clock.

At two o'clock P.M. the House resumed its session.

REFERENCE OF MESSAGES.

On motion of Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio, the message of the House of Bishops (No. 11) in regard to the division of the Diocese of Ohio was referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses.

On motion of Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, Messages Nos. 8 and 9 of the House of Bishops were referred to the Committee on Canons.

LESSONS FOR LENT.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut, presented a Table of Lessons for Lent, which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

The PRESIDENT. The House will now resume the consideration of the matter pending when the recess was taken, being the preamble and resolution offered by the Deputy from Long Island [Rev. Dr. Schenck].

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Mr. President, if I did not feel most deeply the importance of this debate, I should not, in my present state of health, venture to engage in it; and, as it is, I shall be exceedingly brief, and shall simply endeavor, with what little physical strength I have, to state some few facts which I think essentially necessary for the decision of this case.

In the first place, as to myself. I announce that I am utterly opposed to relinquishing in any manner, directly or indirectly, either affirmatively or by any implication, one jot or tittle of the national independence of this Church. Under no possible contrivance, by no possible implication, in no possible way do I propose as a layman of this great Church to allow any interference with its continental independence. I hope that is plain enough. Now, I will go farther. I do not think the Lambeth Conference has yet endangered the independence of this Church. I do not think, if properly conducted, it will ever endanger the independence of this Church. These are facts which it seems to me ought to dispel all apprehension on this occasion.

There are several parties to this movement of different temperaments. One of them is the great Apostolic Prelate whom we have welcomed twice to this Convention, the illustrious Prelate of whom I speak with the most unbounded admiration as a Churchman, as a gentleman, as a historian, as a man. In every capacity in which I can know human nature he deserves honor and affection. I do not enter into the motives of this movement, but I simply say that he is affirmatively moving, in my belief, to gratify what he has largely developed in his great nature, the power of organicism. He does wish, I have no doubt, something like an organic union of the two Churches of the two great English-speaking races. That movement, to a certain extent, is creditable and desirable, but to a certain other extent it is extremely dangerous and utterly inadmissible.

There is no doubt the Bishop of Lichfield has in view some measures that shall, in the first place, secure the integrity of the Prayer-Book. I see before me many clerical faces; and let me ask who is there here that does not want to secure the integrity of the Prayer-Book from all mutilation, from indiscreet alteration, and from all partial readjustment for any local or temporary purpose? I am opposed to all alterations in the Prayer-Book at the present, and will go to the last extremity to oppose any alteration whatever in it.

One great object that he has in view, I believe, is to induce the two great Churches to hold one doctrine on that subject, to say that they will not allow the Prayer-Book, I am almost willing to go as far as to say that we will not alter it, except by the conjoint consent of the two great English Churches, the Church of old England and the greater Church of New England, and when I say that I do not underrate this Church in old England. Old England has a laity of thirty millions of people,

but we represent a laity which will soon be many more millions. We have a large Church, and we shall soon represent more laity. Therefore, we have a Church of more efficiency, a stronger Church, a better Church than the Church of England. For this reason I am not willing to make this Church subordinate to the Church of England.

One issue now forced upon us is the striking out of the Filioque clause in the Creed as to the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. We have a dozen memorials before us on that subject. One good reason why it should not be done is that the English Church is not yet ready, and it is much better to secure the co-operation of the Anglican Church and the American Church at some harmonious, voluntary, fraternal conference, so as to have co-ordinate action on that point. Surely, however, we can act together without organic union. Perhaps there are points, which I will not now go into, where slight alterations in the Prayer-Book would secure more peace in our Church, but they ought not to be made lightly.

I would willingly put my hand in my pocket to help pay the expenses of the Bishops attending this fraternal Conference. There is nothing wrong in a Conference assuredly; but if you think it be without merit, trample it under foot instantly. I have no objection to the Bishops of these two English-speaking nations meeting in Conference. These nations ought always to be at peace. When lately fifteen millions of dollars were paid to this country by England in settlement of certain claims, I said, "We have been badly treated by England in former times, but reparation has been made, and I am content." This Church ought to be content. In these two countries there are more Episcopalian Christians than there were in the whole Roman Empire in the days of Claudius. It is proposed that these two great masses of English-speaking Christians shall have a meeting, and when they get together they shall have somebody to sit in the Chair, to be the President. Certainly somebody must occupy the Chair; and the distinguished man to whom I have referred thinks that by virtue of ancient traditions and the usage of a thousand years the Archbishop of Canterbury should be that man; but as we have not lived a hundred years we do not yet see that it should be so.

Again, he proposes that the Archbishop shall appoint in the course of time a council to pronounce on all controverted questions of doctrine, and especially on all alterations of the Prayer-Book, and that we should guide ourselves by the judgment of that council. I am opposed to that. I think that is organic, very organic indeed, an organism that strikes right into our doctrine. I trust this House of Deputies will never agree to it. But what says the Archbishop of Canterbury? In the report of the debates in the Convocation, the Archbishop of Canterbury dissented from this view. He said he did not wish any attempt to create, under any name, a patriarchate; that any such name he was utterly opposed to; and that he would not consent to call the Lambeth Conference, except on condition that no such proposition should be made. He also said, what is still more important, that he would not invite the Conference if they were to do any business of an organic character—he did not use these words, but that was the substance—and he did not wish them to recommend any measure for adoption. His phrase was that they should confer together, exchange opinions side by side, but not propose, still less adopt, any distinct measures. It would simply be a conversation, mutual explanations, trying to come together, for these two Churches are mother and daughter, and if any man is ashamed of the Church of England, our Mother-

Church, I am ashamed of him. Let mother and daughter come together and have a friendly talk. Are you not willing that our Bishops shall go as far as that? Why not introduce a resolution saying how far you are willing that they shall go?

But, sir, this is an invitation to the Bishops. I say for one that I shall be very glad to see our Bishop of New York go. He will be honored wherever he goes. It is for him to accept the invitation. If he chooses to go, let him go. Surely, let him go if he thinks he can do any good by going. But why do we need any organized action on the subject? If the gentleman who offers the resolution will not withdraw it, I ask him to modify it by adding such terms as will show our intention to preserve for all time to come the independence of our beloved Church.

We have a solemn duty in this Church to discharge with the English Church. What is that solemn duty? What is the common danger? What is the common enemy? Who but the Pope of Rome? Is he not the enemy on this continent, and also abroad? I will stand by the English Church shoulder to shoulder, breast to breast, if it is necessary, to fight the Pope—I do not mean to fight the Pope personally, but to resist Papal assumptions. I shall resist them at all times, and in all places, and in all possible manners. That, I think, is the great call for the junction of these Churches, and their junction will lead to another conjunction. When these Churches agree to talk together—that is all we ask, that they shall talk together, not act—when the great English-speaking races shall have thus agreed, the great Slavonic race will come in, the Greek Church is ready to join us at once. We can unite, and with this combined power of ours the Pope will be shorn to a very great extent. I am for co-operation, not conjunction. All I ask is that we may co-operate, compare ideas together, and report the result. When there is a congress of nations, the representatives of each confer with the others, and go back and report to their own Government. So with this Congress of Churches co-operating with each other, one regarding itself as good as the other. That is the species of Conference I want. I am for having our Bishops go to the Lambeth Conference under certain specific limitations, and I hope some gentleman who has more strength and more voice than I will draw up the proper restrictions.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it seems to me there are two questions: First, How does this matter come before us? Our honored guest, the Bishop of Lichfield, publicly here called our attention to this matter, and to the great benefits which had resulted from the previous Conference, and to the benefits which he anticipated from a subsequent Conference. I think after listening to this suggestion it is very proper for us to entertain a proposition to give our consent or advice to our right reverend fathers to accept any such proposition as may come before them. Then, sir, I have been personally spoken to by one or two Bishops, and requested to say something in favor of it. As I understand, our Bishops are not Lord Bishops. They are very ready and willing, in the true American style, to receive suggestions from this House; and I understand from them that, if we express our willingness that they should go over and meet the other Bishops, it will be a reason for their leaving their Episcopal duties at home, because we think that they really go with reference to a certain object.

Sir, I have listened to the speeches of the learned gentlemen on the floor, particularly to our learned and very highly respected Chairman of the Committee on Canons, and I have great respect for his opinion and advice. He tells us of the past Confer-

ence, and he does not know that anything good came of it. I think there may be things in heaven and earth that are not within the philosophy even of the learned Chairman of our Committee on Canons. Then my friend and colleague from Massachusetts has a great deal to say about it, and he tells us not to do it, because this and that may result. Do what? All that we say is, "We advise you, if you are invited to go abroad and have a Conference, to do it." They can do nothing. They cannot legislate—the matter comes before us to legislate. It is for their information. Sir, here is a common matter of saving souls, and human nature is the same here as in England, and persons who are engaged in that great work can learn a great deal by conferring with persons on the other side of the water. I think they will learn something. Then the benighted "Britishers" may learn something too. I had the honor of being present at a Church Congress in England some four years ago, and you would have thought the Church of Christ was confined to the realm of England. I am very glad to let them know that if they come to this continent, crossing 3,000 miles of ocean, they can then travel 3,000 miles of railroad and find a Church of Christ at every stopping place in full communion with them. I would like them to realize a little the extent of our own Communion, and I think that great benefits would result simply from a conference. Then when they have had the conference, let our right reverend fathers instructed come back and tell us what is the use of it, and then it will be time enough to do the things recommended by it.

My colleague tells us about potentialities. Sir, it is a potentiality that when I go out of this House I may fall down and break my leg; and yet notwithstanding that potentiality I mean to do it. If this House is going to wait before doing anything until it has considered every potentiality, in my opinion this House will do nothing. I am for performing this act of courtesy, and advising our Bishops simply to go abroad and have a conference with their brethren abroad, and let them come back and tell us what they have heard, and then it will be time for us to consider the mischief that may result from any action proposed.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the resolution presented by the Reverend Deputy from Long Island, to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

"That this House, having received with deep interest the intimation given by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield of a probable call to a new Lambeth Conference, will for action await definite information from the House of Bishops on that subject."

My reason for presenting that as an amendment to the resolution offered by the Deputy from Long Island is, first, that we are dealing, at great loss of time, with a subject which is before us so vaguely, so indefinitely, and so far in the future, that we do not know what its bearing is to be or what its effect is really to be upon the Church; that we are not prepared to take action, and that we are not prepared, above all things, to commit ourselves in terms so strong as those used by the original resolution that this House will assent to whatever measures may be proposed looking to a renewed Lambeth Conference. That did commit us, and commit us very strongly. I think that it will be a relief to the House and a measure of safety, of prudence, of proper judgment, that we put off action in this respect until a proposition is before us, and we know what we are to act upon.

The PRESIDENT The question is on the amendment.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I wish merely to say a word. The amendment just offered meets my views precisely, especially after the resolution offered by my reverend friend from Long Island, and it meets my views on the principle which my good friend who alluded to me a short time since will understand. We have heard of a certain lady in Boston who was in the habit of minding her own business; and it is a common saying nowadays when persons meddle with that which does not concern them and does not come properly before them that they had better mind their own business. This is virtually minding our own business since this amendment has come forward. It is a question for the Bishops to settle. I would ask this House who authorized, who assented to, who advised the Bishops to attend the first Lambeth Conference? Did we? It never came before the House of Deputies. Such a thing was not known here.

There is a good reason besides why this amendment should be made. The Lord Bishop of Lichfield, in his remarks here, alluded to that Conference. It would be an act of respect to pass a resolution such as the gentleman from Central Pennsylvania has just offered; but had not that allusion been made, I say it would have been, not a mind-your-own-business affair, but a work of supererogation for us to say a word about it or meddle with it until the Bishops saw fit to ask our opinion, and if they did I should think they would say, "As wise men, if you think it best for us to go, tell us so, but you must provide the expenses; we have not the salaries or the revenues of Lord Bishops." The taunt was once thrown out by a Church print that if a Bishop does not go it is because his Diocese will not vote him enough money to go. That was not the case with the Bishop of my Diocese. That taunt caused us to pass a vote, saying to him, "Whenever you wish to go abroad and stay six months or a year, we will pay your expenses," and that took away the sharp edge of that paragraph in the newspaper.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I should have no objection, Mr. President, to the acceptance of the amendment offered by the Deputy from Central Pennsylvania, and for the reason that it meets a duty which this House ought to perform in response to the words which have fallen, both in sermons and address, from the Bishop of Lichfield; and it also enables the Bishops to act in the matter. For them to take the initiative in a measure which is thought to compromise this Church is too much to ask at their hands. I believe they are ready to respond, but they want the concert and approval of this House.

Now, sir, I wholly dissent (and with great regret I say it) from the venerable Deputy from Connecticut, when he said he had seen no advantages that had followed from the meeting of the former Lambeth Conference. When one takes into account the measures that were then initiated and committed, from which no reports have come back to the general Church, and that those are awaiting the action of a future Conference, and when one considers, in addition to that, the solid, compact body which this Anglican Communion made on that occasion, to the admiration, I believe, of almost every branch of the Church; showing a power and vigor and life that had not been before thought of in connection with the same—when one considers these two advantages, he can hardly say that no benefit has resulted from that Conference.

Sir, is it a matter of no interest to him who is an heir to the privileges of this Church to know that he belongs to a Communion numbering to-day about 160 chief pastors, about 25,000 clergymen, about as many millions of Christians, and about two or three

hundred millions of heathens under the care of these two Communions. Is it a matter of no consequence to him who wants to be able to present a solid front against the Papal power, or who wants to come by any impressive march to the doors of the Eastern Church, to speak not as a sect but as a branch of the original communion of the Church Catholic of Christ? Is it, I say, of no interest to him that we belong to a body that is not simply bounded by two oceans, but which belts the globe with its missions, and with its orisons and evensongs every day that the annual sun circles about the globe?

I am in favor of keeping our nationality. I do not believe it is possible for this Church to surrender nationality. No legislation for a national Church can be otherwise than national. But I believe it is possible to have an organ of intercommunion between the branches of the same. I believe it is possible to have a sort of Primate who shall be a representative of unity, but with no power to control. That might be of great value. Doubtless, the Bishop of Lichfield expects more. He wishes some surrender. He thinks some surrender perhaps will be asked for; he wants to make something like an organic unity: but he has expressly told his friends that so far from the Episcopate in the See of Canterbury aspiring to the primacy, the Archbishop of Canterbury refuses to be thought of as a Patriarchate or even as a Primate. He does not wish any such title. He thinks it may complicate matters in a way which may prove to be inextricable. And let us bear in mind that whatever action is initiated and consummated, so far as the Conference can go at the Lambeth Conference, will have to be brought back to this Synod for ratification before a single step can be taken; and every Synod, in its corporate capacity and by its representatives, will give its assent or dissent to the measures there begun.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I move that the whole subject be laid upon the table.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I appeal to the gentleman's courtesy, as I introduced the resolution, to allow me to make a few remarks in conclusion. This is almost an unprecedented thing, when we are having a grave debate of this kind, to have us all silenced in this manner. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his motion.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. If it be distinctly understood that my motion is renewed as soon as the gentleman takes his seat, and that my withdrawal of it is not to be an opening of the way to further discussion, I will yield; but if that cannot be done, I persist in my motion.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I do not like to avail myself of a privilege which is not to be accorded to other members of the Convention, unless it may be as the mover of the resolution I am in common courtesy entitled to the last remarks on it.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman himself renew the motion to lay on the table as soon as he finishes?

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I cannot.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Then, I persist in my motion.

Mr. GARTHWAITE, of New Jersey. On this question the lay deputation from New Jersey call for a vote by orders.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I appeal to the representation from the Diocese of New Jersey not to make a test upon this question. If the House lays the resolution on the table and indicates thereby an aversion to the proposition, the gentleman can make a motion at any time to take it up and then make his test on that question. If the House should now vote down the motion to lay on

the table, then the question would come up on the amendment, and on the original proposition as amended or unamended, as the case might be, at either of which periods the call for a vote by orders could be entertained. What I mean is, that a vote by orders on this question will not settle anything, but the Diocese of New Jersey of course has the right to demand it.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. Is a motion to lay on the table debatable?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir; but an appeal has been made to the judgment of the delegation from New Jersey to withdraw the call for a vote by orders, and I am awaiting the result.

Mr. GARTHWAITE, of New Jersey. The call is not withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT. Then the vote will be taken by orders on the motion to lay on the table the whole matter.

The Secretary called the roll of Clerical Deputies.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. If it be in order by the authority of the House, as it is necessary in order to carry this motion to have a united vote of the clergy and laity, and it is very evident that the clergy have voted very decidedly in the negative, I would like, in order to save time, leave to withdraw the motion, if it can be done.

The PRESIDENT. That cannot be done. The taking of the vote must be concluded.

The Secretary called the Lay Deputies, and the result of the vote was announced as follows:

Clerical Vote (41 Dioceses represented)—1 Aye (Pennsylvania); 40 Nays.

Lay Vote (37 Dioceses represented)—1 Aye (Pennsylvania); 35 Nays; 1 Divided (Tennessee).

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Deputy from Central Pennsylvania [Rev. Dr. Paret].

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment and in favor of the original resolution for reasons which I will indicate very briefly. It is clear, I think, that since the Bishop of Lichfield has made allusion to this matter in his speech, some reply is courteously due from this House. That being taken for granted, the question arises what shall be our reply? If the amendment is passed, the House of Bishops will look upon it as the opinion of this House that it is not in favor of the meeting again of the Lambeth Conference. If, on the contrary, the original resolution is passed, the House of Bishops will look upon it as an indication that this House is in favor of such a meeting.

Then, in addition to what has been urged in favor of this meeting, let me present one or two other considerations. It is clear, I think, that no organic union can by any possibility take place between the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America before a concrete proposition is offered to this House. No matter how much it may be discussed in the Lambeth Conference, no matter if the opinion of the majority of those Bishops should be in its favor, it cannot be accomplished, it cannot move one inch ahead, until it has received the sanction of this body.

Taking that for granted likewise, I will present one other consideration which has not yet been adverted to. I am in favor of the meeting of this Conference. I hope it will meet. I hope the Bishops in the two countries will assemble and hold council together, for the reason that it will be an additional safeguard to any which we have now against divergence in doctrine, a danger of the highest eminence and which threatens us possibly very nearly.

I am as much opposed as any member on the floor of this House to the giving up of our independence as a Church; but we may carry our independence into the extreme of isolation. We may refuse to confer with our brethren from other Churches; we may close our own doors, until we are all ready and ripe for some scheme which will virtually sever us doctrinally from the bodies with which we are in communion. Therefore, it is of the highest importance, it is in obedience to the Christian instinct, and which ever struggles for the largest possible symbol of all who compose the Christian communion, that the representatives of those agreed in doctrine shall meet for conference.

We are already threatened with innovation in doctrine. Propositions are brought before this House which will amount, if carried, to a severance doctrinally between us and the Church of England. I have heard, on this floor, many memorials presented, the result of which, if granted, would be to eradicate the Filioque clause from our Creed, and thereby we should be severed from the Church of England. We hold ourselves opposed to schism. This is the basis of all conceivable and possible schisms that could then take place. Other measures of collateral importance have been proposed, and it is, as I say, as an additional safeguard against any such divergence as this that I hope this Conference will meet. If the Bishops do all hold conference together, we shall be brought near together, the tie of cohesion will be strengthened, the danger of divergence lessened, if for no other reason than to preserve our doctrine to the slightest particular. A divergence in doctrine is sure to be followed by divergence in practice.

For this reason, as well as other reasons, which I will leave to other members to indicate, I am in favor of the resolution, and of an endorsement on the part of this House of the meeting of the Lambeth Conference.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I have not the advantage of having heard the debate which I understand to have been carried on here before the recess of the Convention. Nevertheless I consider that this debate is one of the most important in which this House is likely to be engaged during its present session. I think that it cannot be denied so to be, since it looks forward to the corporate action of the Anglican Communion in the grandest body that can be assembled, until, in the providence of God, there may hereafter be assembled such a meeting as his Lordship the Bishop of Lichfield spoke of the other day; that is to say, a General Synod of the whole Anglican Communion, represented in the persons of its Bishops, its clergy, and its laity.

I think, sir, when we look back to the last Lambeth Synod, that, upon the whole, there is nothing in the world to be ashamed of—nothing in the world that we ought not, on the contrary, to thank God for, even while we recognize imperfections in connection with it. I think that we have felt stronger, stronger as a Church, stronger as Churchmen, and as Catholic Christians strongest of all, since the day that sent forth to the Church of Christ greetings in Christ all over the world, in that grand Encyclical which would have been worthy of an oecumenical council of the primitive age. [Applause in the galleries.] Sir, I am proud—

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman will have to sit down unless that clapping be stopped.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Am I out of order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. I suppose that the unseemly conduct will not be repeated, and therefore you can go on.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, do not desire to make a speech; I am in no condi-

tion to make a speech; and yet I find it necessary to guard what I shall say by saying that which I am now about to utter. I consider that the grandest meeting of Bishops, the greatest, noblest for the good of Christ's Church Catholic which has been held for centuries is that Conference which was held at Lambeth but a few years ago. I think that the holy man who presided over that Conference must have rejoiced over that last work of his ever since that time in the midst of the rest of Paradise.

Therefore I am not at all indisposed to support the movement for a Lambeth Conference, or for its re-assembling. On the contrary, I think nothing now can be done that will be more important in the history of our Church than that assembly of our chief pastors. At the same time I prefer the amendment offered to the original resolution, for reasons which I shall be able to express, I trust, with brevity. The first is this: that we as yet know nothing of the manner of the invitation. We as yet do not know in what form or in what terms the invitation given to our Bishops will be couched; and let me say that that is a very important matter, for in the history of this Lambeth Conference it is a fact that three terms of perfect technical distinctness have been used, and that each one of those three terms would of necessity modify our opinion of the invitation. Nothing could be gentler or more modest than the original invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion to attend a Conference. That is perfectly modest. Why should they not on such a summons go, as they did go, with their hearts in their hands? But, sir, in the reports of the Lambeth Conference the phraseology was changed in a significant manner. We are told in those reports that the Conference was *convened*; and lately, in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury used a still stronger phrase when he spoke of his reverend predecessor having *summoned* the Synod.

Now, if our Bishops are to be "invited" by their brother and chief, we shall be glad to have them go, at least I shall. If they are to be "convened," I should like to know the reasons why that word "convened" is used, or whether they have left it to the Archbishop of Canterbury by their own instructions to use his discretion in convening them. But if a Synod is to be "summoned" I object. We know no such body. We know no authority in any man on earth to summon our Bishops there as a Synod. Therefore, I repeat, Mr. President, it is a matter of some importance to us to know in what words this invitation, the act of convening or summons, may be made. I take it we know nothing about that yet.

Again, glorying as we do in all that was done in the first Lambeth Synod—and it was certainly a vast work to be called only a Conference—although we glory in the great work that it did, there were, notwithstanding, connected with it some things which we cannot glory in, some things that were decided defects; for instance, when the Bishops of this Church and the Bishops of the English Colonies found themselves in London, some of them having travelled thousands upon thousands of miles, they discovered that the programme of that meeting was already decided in advance; that the very subject that they went most particularly to consider was pronounced upon, that is, the faith of this Church then assailed by the apostate Bishop Colenso, which had been cut out from the programme; and that a private understanding had been entered into by the Archbishop himself that that greatest and gravest of all matters should not be considered. Surely we ought to know whether our Bishops are to go there as free men, honored, or whether they are to go

with their mouths shut in advance, before we say that we are quite prepared to have that repeated.

Again, when they arrived in London our Bishops discovered that the term during which the session of the Lambeth Conference was to be held should be restricted to four days. What ? Journey for weeks at an enormous expense to sit for four days upon the whole well-being of the Catholic Church as represented in all the multitudinous provinces of the British dominions and of this broad land ! And mark, Mr. President and brethren, this restriction of the session to a four days' period was done, as also the cutting out of the programme was done, without the least consultation with any one of our Bishops. When they arrived there they protested against it. But to what avail ? To none whatever. Is that anything like a free Synod of the Catholic Church ? I say no. And if our Bishops are to go there otherwise than as they would be in a free Synod of men who are equal in office, equal in dignity, equal in authority in the Church, I for one object to their going.

Since those were features of the last Lambeth Conference I take it we would like to know something about the facts of the present arrangements before we give an unqualified acclamation.

But there is still another thing which I think ought to be considered by the Convention. It is, that the Lambeth Synod sat in secrecy. I think a meeting of the Bishops may, for sundry reasons, well be held with closed doors ; but in this particular case I think it in the last degree dangerous and objectionable. It is tolerated in our own Church, though I do not think it is perfectly approved either by the clergy or the laity ; but, in the case of the Lambeth Synod, where clergy and laity are represented alone by those of the chief order, I think we are entitled, before we approve the thing, to know whether we are to know anything about it. I am opposed to one order representing all the other orders, while the other orders remain in ignorance of what is done. I regard that point of secrecy in the arrangements of the last Lambeth Conference as an element of extreme danger, to which this House is not prepared to give its sanction in advance—at least, without a larger consideration than we have any ground to think has yet been given to it.

Again, a matter strikes me as of very great importance before we determine to pass resolutions on this subject. It is, what after all is the distinctly recognized grand object of reassembling this Lambeth Conference ? We are not in ignorance of what object it is ? I had the misfortune to be absent this morning on account of indisposition, and on coming into the House I asked whether the objects for which the Lambeth Synod is proposed to be reconvened or reassembled had been mentioned on the floor. I was told not. Therefore, if I go over the ground that has been already occupied, Mr. President, I shall be glad to be cut short. I say we are not left in doubt as to the object of this reassembling of the Lambeth Conference, because it has been distinctly announced by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, our most honored guest, in a speech of his in the Upper House of Convocation, which has been printed in our American papers, which I read—and I say it with great humility, and yet at the same time I feel compelled in this presence to say it—which I read with amazement ; which I read with astonishment ; for, sir, I think I am not mistaken in representing the whole drift of that proposition to have been this : that there should be erected a Patriarchate in name of the Church of the Anglican Communion in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury ; and if anybody thinks that this matter of first giving a title amounts to nothing, then I would suggest that he has not read church history with any great attention. A patriarchate

may mean nothing. I believe the Bishop of Rome has several patriarchates, which are nothing but titular nonentities. Do we want such personages in our Church as titular nonentities ? Is this the day when our Church has time to consider mere titles of honor and precedent ? Would the Archbishop of Canterbury be more honored, more looked up to, or would he not rather be looked upon in this Church with greater disfavor, jealousy, and disaffection on account of the conferring of that title of Patriarchate ? These are things to be considered.

Again, it was openly announced in Convocation by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield himself that it might in the end result from the Lambeth Conference, shortly to be reassembled, that we should have an ultimate Court of Appeals in matters of doctrine, to consist of the Patriarch of Canterbury and other personages resident in England. Would we like to have that ? Are we likely to want it ? I say nay, and this Church will say nay ; for, sir, this Church as a national unit among the Churches of God can tolerate no authority over her save that of Christ, her head, and her own national authority.

Now, Mr. President, it is well for us, in view of these facts which I have recounted of the way in which the call may be made, of the manner in which the programme may be laid out, of the restriction of the liberties of our Bishops in what will profess to be a free conference, of the objects, large as they are, of the most immense importance, touching in the end the very foundation of our Church as laid down in her organic law and constitution—I ask, is it well for us to adopt indefinite resolutions of a gushing sort, or is it not better for us to take the calm, the prudent, the dignified course which has been laid out in the amendment proposed to the original resolution ?

And, Mr. President, I trust this matter may come before us from the House of Bishops. The invitation has already doubtless been conveyed to them by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, whatever its form or terms may be. Doubtless, the Bishops will let us know what shape that has taken, what the propositions are likely to be. In short, I think they will communicate with us as the fathers to grown-up sons, and then, I think, we can intelligently, with all our hearts, with all the warmth of our natures, give to it our most cordial sanction, in hopes of their preparing the way for another and a still larger Lambeth Conference.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. As to the remark of the learned and reverend Deputy from Alabama, that the original resolution is gushing, inasmuch as he has never heard it read or seen it, to my certain knowledge—

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I have heard it repeated.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. No, sir ; because it is a long resolution, and I do not think anybody has committed it to memory. The gentleman may have heard the substance.

I am opposed to this amendment, I am sorry to say, for I should be glad in courtesy to accept it, if I could consistently. I am opposed to it because it is, not in the intention of the Deputy who offered it, but, intrinsically, meaningless. The House of Bishops have nothing to send to us. They have no information to give us. There is nothing that we can extract from the House of Bishops by any such amendment as that which is proposed. The Lord Bishop of Lichfield has not conveyed the intimation to the House of Bishops, and will not. That is not the proposed order. The method for the assembling of this second session of the Lambeth Council is as follows : Intimations are given informally by the Archbishop of Canterbury that the idea of reassembling is entertained. Those intimations are sent to different parts of the Church throughout the world,

and then, if they act upon that intimation and send back to the Archbishop, formally or informally, in any way they please, their response that an invitation to such a Conference would be generally responded to, the invitation goes forth, and not till then. There have been memorials sent from Canada, and from various colonial Churches, up to the Archbishop of Canterbury already, because this intimation of desire to hold a Conference went forth many months, if not a year or more ago. The memorials sent to the Archbishop requesting him to call it are in print and have been circulated throughout the world, and we are probably the only branch, if we may call ourselves a branch, of the Anglican Communion that has never yet taken any action in the premises. The House of Bishops here feel a degree of delicacy in acting upon the matter until they have some intimation from this House that such action would be agreeable to us, not only upon the point which has been adverted to, that they do not like to elect themselves to an office or to a deputation the expenses of which may come from the laity or from the Church at large. On the contrary, they feel that if there is a desire that they should occupy any such position, that desire should first be expressed on the part of those who probably will send them on their mission; and I think that every ingenious mind will appreciate at once the delicacy of their position in this regard; and, therefore, I have to say that there will no such suggestion come to us from the House of Bishops. They have no information to give us.

The very learned Deputy from the Diocese of Alabama has given us as full information upon one branch of the subject as we can possibly get through any one of the Bishops; and so we have had from others who have spoken on this question information submitted here which I think ought by this time to inform the mind of the Convention on the whole subject, except certain matters which, I think, are matters of very grave mistake.

Touching this idea of an organic unity, if you please, or the suggestions that were made by the Bishop of Lichfield in the Upper House of Convocation, after all, Mr. President, what are they but suggestions? What are they but his individual opinion? No action was taken in the Upper House of Convocation on this subject. It was merely the expression of an opinion of one of the Bishops; and supposing he puts that opinion in form, and carries it into this second session of the proposed Council at Lambeth, they have no power to pass it; they are not a representative body in any sense of delegation, of being sent formally or officially. It is merely a body that comes together informally for a comparison of views, and for the attempted adjustment of everything that needs righting throughout Christendom by moral force alone, and by the influential power that naturally pertains to their great office. But supposing they had the power and did create a patriarchate, the gentleman asks, would this Church accept it? No; it certainly would not accept it. The representation from this Church would have no power to act for us in that matter; and if they came back here with the official record of any such decision in that Council of Lambeth, this Church would have the right to put its foot upon it. It would be perfectly free, untrammelled by any action that might be taken there. But I distinctly state that it has not been entertained in any quarter save the one to which reference has just now been made; and in any quarter that is entitled to grave consideration, it has not been proposed to do anything that is either aggressive looking toward a patriarchate or that is organic looking

to any unity of this Church in any more ecclesiastical relations than are now held.

I want the members of the Convention to understand that this is not a political question, nor is it so much a historic question, and I have in my mind, while listening to certain parts of this debate, deprecated the allusion to the difficulty of obtaining the Episcopate, because we know full well that the difficulties that environed the Church of England and the Church in this country at that time, owing to the political relationships as well as other causes, were such as made the obstacles great; but we know that since that time every form of communion and fellowship and courtesy has been assumed by the Church of England towards us. If the record of all the years that have elapsed from that day to this is not sufficient to obliterate the recollection of any little difficulties that we encountered then, centuries upon centuries, in the minds of some men, would not obliterate it.

So do I deprecate the reference to the political relations between England and this country. All these ought to be buried so deep that nothing could ever resurrect them from their oblivion, so far as our moral sense and our personal relations and our national intercourse are concerned. The great events that have occurred in the adjustment of national difficulties between England and this country, of a very recent date, are so fresh in the minds of us all that I scarcely, for one, have patience to listen to anything that goes behind or beyond them. On the contrary, we are one in the sentiments that govern our hearts as freemen, as partakers of the same civilization, as, under God, enjoying the same blessings of His providence and the same blessings of His grace in the blessed communion of that Church which is one in Christ Jesus; and I want the members of this Convention to look at it from that standpoint. In this debate there should be no appeal to the excited passions of men, touching matters of record, either in ecclesiastical or political history. On the contrary, it is a question of the communion of saints in Christ Jesus. I, if I am a member of Christ here in New York, am a member in London, as a gentleman said to me to-day in private conversation, or in Jerusalem, and to the end of the earth; and wherever I find the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I not only feel that there I am bound together by the common doctrines that make us one in that Christ, but in that formal, visible fold where we have around us the same defences and substantially above us the same divine regis of protection.

I therefore submit that all these "Gorgons and chimeras dire" that have by the splendid Hotspurs in debate been "summoned from the vasty deep" of their imaginations be laid to rest. I would exorcise this Convention from all these spectres and phantasms that have been depicted upon the curtain of the future in such felicitous phrases by the distinguished Clerical Deputies from Connecticut and Massachusetts. These things are only born of men's fears. They are only the creations of men's fancies. I am prepared to say that there has not been submitted to this House by either of those gentlemen an argument that is based upon facts as they are, or arguments that are based upon the analogies of history or arguments that can have any fair showing when a proper opportunity has presented for holding them up in the clear light of truth, as that truth reflects upon them from every side.

I am exceedingly sorry, as I said before, that this debate has run into such wide extremes; but since questions have come up, in God's name, let us meet them, and do not let us at all attempt to stifle the expression of the sentiments of this Convention upon this subject. I think the most of the issues

of this debate are false ones. I think the simple question is that of the original resolution. I am not in favor of the suggestion made by the Deputy from New York [Mr. Ruggles], proposing that if we do send the Bishops over there we shall send them trammelled, harnessed from head to foot with conditions and limitations. We cannot trust them to go over unless they are swathed almost in grave-clothes, so that they can scarcely utter speech or make a motion!

I am not in favor of the amendment of the Clerical Deputy from Central Pennsylvania. That proposes to send it to the Bishops for them to tell us what all this means, and for them to tell us what has been submitted to them, when we know that nothing has been submitted to them, and that nothing will be submitted to them, and that the only possible course of procedure is that which is proposed in the original resolution, and that if you carry that amendment it is just the same as negating the whole idea; it is just the same as saying, "We will have nothing to do with this proposed Council of Bishops; we are afraid to trust our right reverend fathers to go over and sit in the company of the prelates of the English Church." Why, sir, the Deputy from Massachusetts said that the Church of England would overwhelm us. Overwhelm this colossus of the American Church! No, sir; we have reached such dimensions that I do not feel any fear of any sister church, or mother church, or grandfather church. [Laughter.]

If the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts was good as against this Pan-Anglican Council, this Lambeth Conference, it is good against all the Primitive Councils. Why, sir, they were willing in a Primitive Council to let one Bishop act as the presiding officer over other Bishops coming from other sees and provinces; and I cannot conceive myself that it is possible to have a Conference or a Synod without a presiding officer; and I certainly understand that the proper person to preside is he who by reason of the seniority of his special Church organization, if you choose, or by reason of his seniority of consecration, or by reason of his exaltation by peculiar office, should be permitted to occupy the seat. I do not see that that in the slightest degree trenches upon the liberties of any other members who are sitting with him as prelates in the same Council.

I cannot for the life of me see anything in these ideas that have been presented to us to frighten us away from this proposed deputation to the second Lambeth Conference. It seems to me that the arguments are so unimportant that by the pricking of a pin you could let out—no, I will not say what is in them. [Laughter.] I beg to submit, therefore, for the consideration of the House, that they vote upon the original proposition, simple and pure. There is no departure from it that does not involve us in complication. The effect of sending the matter back to the House of Bishops under the amendment proposed by the Deputy from Central Pennsylvania, amounts in fact to negating the whole thing. I do not believe that is his intention; I know from what he said that it is not his intention; but it amounts to that practically; and I therefore invoke my good friends of the clergy and laity that they will either vote it down upon a square issue or carry it in its original form.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I will not answer my reverend brother from Long Island, so far as his poetry is concerned. I do not deem myself competent to answer that. I have become too old to be a poet or to have much poetry in my composition. I deal with plain matters of fact.

He proposes that we should put in a

pin or a needle. I will do it for him. I will ask him a question, and I want the gentlemen of this House to understand his answer. He says he belongs to the Church Catholic, and if he goes to England he is as much a member of the Church Catholic there, and is entitled to and would receive all the privileges there that he receives here. Now, let me ask my brother, suppose he goes, or a Bishop of this Church goes there, and wants to spend a month there, and would like to preach during that month, has he the right to do it? Has he, as a Priest or a Bishop of this American Church, a right to do it? No, sir. You have a certain permission of Parliament. On application to the Bishop of the Diocese where you are to officiate, you are permitted to appear once or twice, and then you have to shut up your mouth. Stick a pin there yourself, if you please, sir. [Laughter.]

Now, another thing: You talk of the Church of England asking us. They have not asked. We have nothing before us from the Bishop of Lichfield or any other man that would warrant our legislation on this subject. No person has asked us yet. Wait till they ask, and then it will be time enough for us to decide the question.

But I want to call the attention of one branch of this House to the fact that the laity have no voice in the affairs of the Church of England. The English Government have; Parliament have; but the laity have none. Suppose one of you goes there as a layman of this General Convention, after voting for anything of this kind, they will treat you as a gentleman, but they will not recognize you as a legislator by any means. I tell you we are not at all on an equality, and I therefore must contend, as I did in the former speech that I made, that until the Church of England is free as we are from the influence of the state, until the Church of England has what she is longing to have, the permission to bring laymen into her councils, diocesan and otherwise, to legislate for her—until that day arrives, it comes with an ill grace from any individual in their behalf, not themselves, to ask us not merely to permit but to urge on our Bishops to go there to be bluffed off, or else, "Humble servant to your Lordship, will you permit me to preach in your cathedral to-morrow?" I do not want a presbyter to be placed in that position, and God forbid that I should lift up my voice to place a Bishop of the Church in that position, or that I should expect laymen to sustain such a resolution for a Church in which they are treated as a mass of nobodies in the Church, except to support it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I wish to say that with regard to this subject I think there has been a great deal of learning and knowledge and principle shown by my old friend from the Diocese of Connecticut, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, by the gentleman from Alabama, and above all by the distinguished layman of whose presence we all are proud from the Diocese of New York (Mr. Ruggles), and I think that to-morrow what these men have said will fly convincingly over all this Union. But in looking at this original proposal, and in looking at the amendment which the gentleman from Central Pennsylvania has moved to it, I see that both the original proposal and this amendment do not express what I distinctly and clearly understand to be the feeling of this Church and also of the members of this great National Council. I therefore take the liberty of proposing, as I believe I have the power to do, an amendment to the whole question. I can do that, I believe.

The PRESIDENT. There is only one amendment pending. An amendment can be offered to that.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I propose to make an amendment which I think will express the power of the arguments that have been brought forward by these gentlemen, and I think it will carry conviction at once. ["Read it."] I shall read it, but I may take my own time to read it, I think. [Laughter.] I will read this amendment, and then speak a few words in its favor:

"Resolved, That we hereby desire the reassembling of the Lambeth Conference."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I ask the gentleman's permission to make a motion that the session be prolonged to half-past four, because otherwise our adjournment will be here in two minutes.

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman give way to that motion?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The difficulty is that there are engagements at four.

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman give way?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House sit until half-past four o'clock to-day.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. My proposition is:

"Resolved, That we hereby desire the reassembling of the Lambeth Conference, and we hope that our Bishops personally may attend according to the best of their judgment; and, when offering this expression of opinion, we hereby, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, most solemnly and emphatically declare that the Church in these United States is not in any sense a member or branch of the Anglican Communion, but is a Sister Church which, in our faith and belief, is in future to be the Church of the whole people of this great land; and we request the Bishops of our Church who attend the second Lambeth Conference to take their stand most distinctly upon this ground."

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say a few words. In the first place, I am proud of the Lambeth Conference and of the attendance of our Bishops upon it. I think that they did perfectly right, and I give them nothing but applause for doing it. Therefore, in speaking on my own behalf, and putting my words into the mouths of the members, clerical and lay, of this Convention, I cannot in any way blame the Lambeth Conference, or any one that attended upon it. It has been productive of good, and of un-mixed good, and, therefore, I think that, when the Bishops are invited, it is not only their business and great pleasure, but their duty also, to attend, according to the best of their own judgments personally.

But we have been told that power, when it begins, never fails to increase itself. There was, before this time, a personal invitation to the Bishops of our Church to go to the Lambeth Conference. We, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, had nothing at all to do with it. Now, as I understand from the distinguished Lay Deputy from Massachusetts, there has an intimation come down from the House of Bishops that if we, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, express an opinion it would be very gratifying indeed. Mr. President, I am for expressing an opinion, and a very distinct opinion, as you know; but the opinion which shall go in to form the basis for first being received, then being summoned, and then finally the whole thing being cumulated into a position which we do not admire and cannot take as a national Church, I do not believe in; and, therefore, I wish, as they have indicated their desire that we should give an opinion, that we should give an opinion.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. They cannot

ask for it except by the House of Bishops sending a message to us.

The Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I am referring to the speech of Dr. Shattuck.

The Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I could tell another story from the House of Bishops, but I prefer not to do it. I have a different story from that, however, but it is not my business to tell it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I would say another thing in regard to the Church in England. There is no man in this Council who has a higher respect for our dear Mother Church of England, but I make one great distinction. The English state, that is to say, the English Government, in its action upon our Church previously, and in its action upon the Church of England at present, I by no means respect. I say that for two hundred years that English state kept us without Bishops, without Council, without cathedrals, without anything that belonged to a Church. Any one of us that desired to be confirmed or ordained had to go to London. We were crushed into the shape of an unconnected mass of Congregational ministers, having no bond of union whatsoever, and that Congregationalism which the hardness of the English state towards its own English communicants settled in these colonies has come down to us in the traditional Congregationalism that is on us at this day and torments us all—clergy and laity, bishops and ministers. I have no respect for that Government in its ecclesiastical operations, which, within the last ten years, laid its strong claw upon the property of the Irish Church, and which, to this day, as they profess in Parliament, can take every morsel of property from the English Church, if it simply chooses to do so, because the English Government has a doctrine which we have not—the doctrine of the omnipotence of Parliament. Parliament can do anything it pleases in the way of property rights. In the debates on that Irish bill, when some one told one of those lawyers, "You dare not do that to a Dissenting denomination," he said, "You make a mistake; we can take the property of Dissenters just as much as we can take the property of the Irish Church."

Sir, I have no respect whatever for the English Government in its relation to the English Church. What does this English Government do now? It simply has the English Church tied up hand and foot. They cannot act; they can pass no law. They may deliberate and speak, but they can do nothing. What is the use, then, of tying a living body to a dead? What is the use of us making any sort of organic union with a Church that is in that shape? It is of no use at all except what? Except for an extreme conservative use, I say it is dead, without a pulse, or hands or feet, so that if we propose anything here in this American Church, and you have an organic union established in any way, a man who is extremely conservative can get up and say, "This question has been decided by the whole Anglican Church." No, sir, the whole Anglican Church will not come to any decision upon it.

I, therefore, in reference to these matters simply gather together the conclusions that I have come to from the speeches of the four distinguished men whom I have mentioned. I think that we can approve of the Lambeth Conference, of its meeting, of the assembling of our Bishops with that Conference personally as men and gentlemen and Christians, and at the same time we can take their chance of cutting away the last floating fragment of the wreck of Anglicanism in this country; that is to say, the feeling that somehow or other, we do not know how, we are members of the English Church, members of the Anglican Communion. For my-

self, I must honestly say that I believe in an ultimate result. I believe that in the course of time, and not a very long time, our organization will be perfected, our Bishops, our clergy, our laity will rise in faith, in doctrine, in holiness, in purity of life, till the whole mass of this great American people shall look upon us and say: "These men, this organization, this institution which hitherto under a mistake we have called the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Anglican Communion is the American Catholic Church of this great land from the great peaceful ocean to the Atlantic, from the north to the south." Therefore, sir, in order to make this matter more distinct, I move this resolution of mine.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not propose to occupy more than about a minute on this question, and it is for the purpose of attempting to correct what I conceive to be a misconception of the language of the original resolution. It seems to me that all the misapprehension in this body in regard to dangers in the future results from overlooking the fact that the language of the resolution contains no consent, no approval to the House of Bishops to do anything more than to engage in a Conference. If the movement is to take the form of a Synod or anything looking to an organic change, the resolution does not authorize it at all. If it is a Conference, this body if it passes this resolution will approve of our Bishops' meeting in that Conference, but if it is a Synod the Bishops if they go there go without the provision of this body. Therefore I do not see any of the dangers which have been so vividly portrayed by gentlemen in reference to this movement. Merely for the purpose of saving time I draw attention to that point.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I was so uncertain as to whether Dr. Adams was in earnest or in joke that I will not presume at this time to dwell even on the argument he presented. I ask the courtesy of the House only for a moment or two while I return my thanks to the Deputy from Long Island for the very courteous manner in which he pronounced my amendment entirely meaningless. It was a sharp saying very softly said. Sir, it is not meaningless. It had a definite purpose, and I think it will appear to the House that its purpose amounts to something. It was so worded carefully as to express most courteously our respect and interest for the intimation that had been given us by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield of a purpose or proposal to invite the Bishops of this Church to a future Lambeth Conference; but it was at the same time so worded that while it expressed that interest, it refused to bind us definitely in any important action or in any manner to a question so important, while it remained in its indefinite and uncertain form. It was, further, so worded that it intimated to the House of Bishops our desire that, as soon as they shall have received any definite information themselves or any due invitation, they shall communicate to us their own knowledge in the matter and enable us to act with certainty. The proposition was not intended, and I think this House will not take it as meant, to express our opinion as opposed to a reassembling of the Lambeth Conference, but only to take this position, that we are not prepared to act upon so momentous a question, while it is yet entirely indefinite, unsatisfactory, and apparently far in the future. I ask for the reading of my amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read. The Secretary read the amendment of Rev. Dr. Paret.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I wish to introduce a substitute for the matter now before House.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a question of order. There are two amendments already before the House. Can a third be proposed.

The PRESIDENT. A substitute can be proposed. Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. My proposition is in this form:

"Resolved, That all exchange of friendly greetings, all evidences of the existence of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace between the Church of England and this Church in America, whether by Bishops in conference or otherwise, are especially welcome to this body."

The objections raised to either of the preceding propositions seem to me very great, but this in my mind is so worded that we throw ourselves to the world open as in harmony with the English Church so far as doctrines and intercommunication are concerned, but that we commit ourselves to no organic union whatever. If this Conference is summoned, and our Bishops go there, they go for the interchange of friendly sentiments, and for the good of the Church, not committing us to anything beyond. That is all.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I second that.

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. Mr. President, I think the large majority of this House are probably in favor of something in the shape of a Conference between the Bishops of this Church and the Bishops of the English Church—a conference for mutual consultation and communion—and no one who looks at it merely in this preliminary light can for a moment question that great benefit must result.

Great emphasis has been laid in this House on the potentialities, as they are called, of the future, the possible dangers that may come back to us from the communion of our Bishops with the Bishops of the English Church. In other words, there are some gentlemen here who seem to be defective altogether in the confidence they have in the wisdom and prudence and discretion of their own Bishops if they should possibly come in contact with the supposed larger wisdom and broader experience of the Bishops of the English Church. I think, sir, we are ready to claim for the Bishops of our own Church at least an equal measure of all these good qualities with that possessed by the rulers of the Church on the other side of the Atlantic; and to counterbalance that idea of the possible dangers that may come back to us, there is another side of the question altogether which has never been alluded to. The subject was indirectly referred to in a conversation, very brief, between myself and a venerable Archdeacon who has no voice in this House, but who I wish had a voice here, for he would give better expression to the idea than I possibly can, namely this: Is it not more than possible that through the communion of the American Church with the representatives of the Anglican, a large measure of benefit, moral and spiritual, may be conveyed to them, and through them as its representatives to the whole body of the Anglican Communion in England? That Church at the present moment is, as is well known, in a peculiar transition process. That process has already been passed through by the Church in Ireland. That Church has been disestablished and disendowed. That Church is now in a condition of new life and vigor and energy in consequence of having passed through that process. It was thought at the first it would be a peculiarly dangerous one; but even already, within the brief time that has elapsed since then, that Church has become more than ever the Church of the affections of the people, and those affections have found for themselves large and liberal and substantial expression.

Now, it is held by a great many deep thinkers, men who have some foreknowledge apparently of the future, that the Church in England is doomed to pass through the same process sooner or later. It is perfectly true that Mr. Gladstone just at the present moment disavows the idea. He repudiates having for the present any intention of severing the bond that unites the Church to the state, but he does so, as is well known, only because the time has not yet come, because public sentiment in England is not yet sufficiently educated up to the point. When that time comes, the Church in England, like the Church in Ireland, will be set free from all shackles of state legislation, and will be able, as she ought to be able, to do her own work for Christ in the world.

Now, sir, if I am any judge of the potentialities of the future—because the potentialities apply in the direction of good as well as of evil—I am strongly of the opinion that if anything could possibly give an impulse to that transitional movement which is already beginning to show itself in England in the direction of the disentanglement of the Church from the entanglements of state enactments, such a movement will be largely impelled and propelled by the powerful influence of the thought and life and energy of the representative men of the American Church coming in contact with the representatives of the Church across the water. We must not think merely of the possibility of seeing harm to ourselves, but the nobler possibility of communicating good to others.

On this ground, as well as on others already alluded to, I think the general question of the expediency of some form of Conference between our Bishops and the Bishops yonder must be very generally assented to; but then there is another question with regard to the action of this House at the present moment with regard to this Conference. You will have observed that, in the statements already made, the most that has been said is that probably there will be another Pan-Anglican Conference. It is merely an intimation that has been conveyed by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield. No formal proposition has been made to this House certainly, and so far as we know no formal proposition or invitation has been made to the House of Bishops. It seems to me that it is quite time enough for this House to take action upon a proposition which is made to us, when that proposition is really made, and that we are altogether premature in taking any action on the matter now. It seems to me, moreover, that when that proposition is made, it will be made not to this House, but to the House of Bishops, and it seems to me that it is highly proper for the House of Bishops to act upon an invitation given to them, but not for us to act upon it. If I receive an invitation I act upon it. My friend sitting beside me does not take action in the matter at all; he has nothing to do with it. This is a matter belonging altogether to the House of Bishops; and moreover if the Bishops in this matter are willing to receive instruction, or counsel, or advice from any one's hands, it seems to me that inasmuch as the invitation, when it does come, is to come to them, not in their collective capacity as a House, but merely to them as individual men representing the Church, they will have to act upon it as individual men, and any instructions or counsel they may feel at liberty, or may deem it expedient to receive, must be received, not from this collective representation of the Church, but from their individual dioceses.

It is they who have to act upon it in connection with the Bishops as individual men; and therefore it seems to me for the present altogether premature for this House to take any action, but rather to leave the matter over in accordance with the terms of the amendment to the original resolution, pro-

posed by the reverend members from Central Pennsylvania. It seems to me entirely proper that the matter should be relegated to the House of Bishops for their individual action upon it.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I move that this subject be postponed until to-morrow at two o'clock, when a vote shall be taken without further debate, for it is now within two minutes of the time of adjournment, and we shall not have time to take the vote.

The PRESIDENT. We have five minutes yet.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I have another remark to make, and that is to say that if the question is postponed until to-morrow, members will have an opportunity of reading these amendments, and comparing them, and of coming to a deliberate conclusion. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Central Pennsylvania merely puts off consideration, and the matter will go up to the House of Bishops, and come back to us, and then we shall have to vote upon it, while the other proposition, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is substantially the same as the original resolution. If you compare them together you will find that they scarcely vary a particle.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Then I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment. We certainly know as much about this case now as we ever shall.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Rev. Mr. Rogers], which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved, That all exchanges of friendly greeting, all evidences of the existence of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace between the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, whether by Bishops in conference or otherwise, are specially welcome to this Church.

"Resolved, That the foregoing resolution be communicated to the House of Bishops as a message from this House."

The substitute was adopted, there being, on a division—Ayes, 108; Noes, 96.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution as amended by this substitute.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT. Rev. Dr. Mead retires from the Committee of Conference relating to the Church in Canada. That leaves the Rev. Dr. Rudder as Chairman, and I name Rev. Dr. Foote, of Western New York, upon that Committee.

Chief-Justice Waite, of Ohio, has left the city, and will not be again in the Convention. He has given me notice to that effect, and I appoint Mr. Hazlehurst, of Pennsylvania, in his place upon the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

From the Committee on the State of the Church, Rev. Dr. Beach, of New York, retires and requests that Rev. Dr. George Jarvis Geer, from the same Diocese, a Provisional Deputy, be appointed in his place. I make that appointment.

The hour of adjournment has arrived, and the House stands adjourned until to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M.

SIXTH DAY.

TUESDAY, October 13.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel, at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was begun by Rev. William H.

Clarke, of Georgia. The Lessons were read by Rev. Samuel Chase, D.D., of Illinois. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. John B. Wakefield, D.D., of Indiana, who also pronounced the Benediction.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

SUPPLEMENTARY DELEGATES.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. On behalf of the Committee on Elections, I respectfully report that due evidence has been received of the appointment of Mr. John Deveraux as supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of Ohio, in place of Mr. Morrison R. Waite, and of the Rev. George Jarvis Geer, D.D., a supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of New York, in place of the Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, D.D., LL.D.; that the names of these Deputies have been given to the Secretary, and entered upon the roll of the House.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. In the absence of the Chairman I have been requested to make two reports from the Committee on Canons:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred certain resolutions relating to Canon 4 of Title II., respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the third section of Canon 4 of Title II. be amended by leaving out these words, 'If any rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the recommendation of the Bishop and Presbyters,' and inserting the following: 'If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop made in pursuance of such recommendation,' so that the whole section may read as in the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 3, of Canon 4, of Title II., be amended, so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop made in pursuance of such recommendation, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial function within the Diocese until he shall retract his refusal. Or, if the vestry or congregation shall refuse to comply with any such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention until they shall have retracted their refusal."

The PRESIDENT. The report will be placed on the Calendar.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW DIOCESES.

The Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed amendment to Section 2, of Canon 6, of Title III., relating to the organization of new Dioceses, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption thereof, as contained in the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 2, of Canon 6, of Title III., be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. In case there should be no Bishop who can call such Primary Convention pursuant to the foregoing provision, then the duty of calling such Convention for the purpose of organizing, and the duty of fixing the time and place of its meeting, shall be vested in the Standing Committee of the Diocese within the limits of which the new one is to be erected, or of the Standing Committee of the eldest of the Dioceses by the junction of which, or parts of which, the new Diocese may be formed; and such standing Committee shall make such call immedi-

ately after the ratification of a division by the General Convention."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

REMOVAL OF COMMUNICANTS.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I have a further report from the Committee on Canons:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed amendment to Section 1 of Canon 12 of Title II., so as to require a certificate to be produced by every communicant upon his removal from one parish to another, and forbidding any rector to receive a communicant without such letter or certificate, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of opinion that it is inexpedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the further consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 1 of Canon 12 of Title II. of the Digest."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

EXPENSES—TREASURER.

Rev. Dr. CRANE, of Mississippi, from the Committee on Expenses, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Expenses report that, having examined the accounts of the Treasurer, they find them accurate and duly vouched:

Total receipts,	.	.	.	.	\$13,526 95
Expenditures,	.	.	.	.	13,094 61
Leaving balance on hand,	.	.	.	.	432 34

"The Committee take pleasure in recognizing the liberality and interest shown by the Treasurer in honoring the drafts made in favor of the Convention, even during the period of financial distress and lack of confidence, so that every obligation of the Convention has been met promptly, and considerable advantages have resulted to the Convention from its ability to make cash payments. The Committee unanimously nominate the present Treasurer for re-election.

"Your Committee offer the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Treasurer of this Convention be instructed to reserve five hundred dollars, to be subject to the call of the Presiding Bishop, for the payment of such expenses as may be incurred by him in the discharge of the duties incident to his office during the next three years.

"Resolved, That the Treasurer be instructed to pay to the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies the sum of seven hundred and fifty dollars, and to the Secretary of the House of Bishops the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars.

"Resolved, That in case the assessment of three dollars for each clergyman, as provided by Canon for the Payment of the Incidental Expenses of the Convention, should be found insufficient for that purpose, the Secretary of this House and the Treasurer jointly are hereby authorized and directed to make such additional assessment on the Dioceses respectively, and the Treasurer to collect the same, as may be found necessary for the payment of such expenses.

"Resolved, That we gratefully recognize the liberality of Trinity Church in its provision for the welfare, comfort, and convenience of the members of this Convention, whereby the facilities of doing our work have been so amply provided and our expenses so materially reduced.

"W. M. C. CRANE, Chairman."

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be placed on the Calendar.

ELECTION OF TREASURER.

Rev. Dr. CRANE, of Mississippi. I suggest that the election of Treasurer be proceeded with. The Committee unanimously nominate the present Treasurer for re-election.

The PRESIDENT. It is proposed that the present Treasurer, Mr. Nathan Matthews, be re-elected.

Rev. Dr. KNICKERBACKER, of Minnesota. I move that the ballot be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the re-election of Mr. Matthews as Treasurer.

Mr. Matthews was elected unanimously.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. Rev. Dr. Payne, of Albany, asks leave of absence for two or three days to attend to imperative parochial duties. Leave was granted.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. Mr. President, the matter to which I propose to call the attention of this Convention is stated very briefly in the written petition I have to present, and I sincerely hope that it may pass without debate. I have no idea of bringing on a debate upon the question of the reference of this petition. Really it comes somewhat in the form of a letter addressed to the House of Bishops on a subject in which we are all very deeply interested. I am anxious, therefore, for the reference of this paper, and I will say before reading it that I believe, if it can be at once referred to the House of Bishops, it will probably succeed in doing some good. Here is the petition, and I shall take the privilege of reading it—

The PRESIDENT. The rule I do not think allows the petition to be read unless the House takes some action upon it. It is for the person who presents it to state concisely the contents of it.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. If you will allow the reading of the petition first, then you can determine the necessary action to follow.

The PRESIDENT. If the gentleman will turn to Rule No. 27 he will see:

"When memorials or petitions are presented, their contents shall be concisely stated by the Deputy presenting them, and they shall be referred or laid upon the table, unless, by a majority vote, the memorial or petition shall be ordered to be read."

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. It is very brief, and I will ask the privilege of reading it.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that the member presenting the petition be permitted to have it read.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. If the rule of the House is to be continually interfered with on the part of gentlemen who assure us that their petitions are very brief, I think we shall have no petitions here but brief ones in their estimation, and I hope that, unless the matter is one very peculiar, it will not be allowed to pass beyond the ordinary rule which affects other petitions or memorials.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that Mr. Trimble, of Arkansas, have leave to read a petition or memorial from that Diocese, as I understand it to be.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. I submit whether the rule does not require that the gentleman shall state the subject of his petition before the House is called upon to pass on that question.

The PRESIDENT. I believe it does.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. I will state the object I have in view. I am only sorry that I cannot read the paper in full; I am very anxious just now on that subject. It is somewhat in the form of a letter to the House of Bishops, by the

Clergy and Laity of the House of Deputies, in reference to the ritual usages of the Church, proposing to lay this matter of ritual directly before the House of Bishops, and ask them to decide somewhat on the matter; not to discuss the whole question here, but to lay the responsibility where it belongs, at the door of the House of Bishops. It is addressed to the House of Bishops.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. What have we to do with a petition to the House of Bishops? If the gentleman from Arkansas has a petition to the House of Bishops, let him present it to the House of Bishops. Does he want us to make that our petition?

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. That is just what I want.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. That is not going to be done without a great deal of debate, I can tell him. There is a great deal of opposition to that. He is perfectly free to make his petition to the House of Bishops without troubling us, and asking this large body to go to work and sanction all that he has been doing down there. [Laughter.]

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. I assure you that I have been doing this on my own responsibility and not from the Diocese of Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT. Has the Deputy any motion to make in reference to his petition?

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. It is as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, That the foregoing address be forwarded at once to the House of Bishops."

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I rise to a point of order. That is a petition in which the gentleman asks the concurrence of this House, that we shall address a memorial to the House of Bishops. I submit, as a point of order, that it should be a memorial to this House. It is not a memorial to this House, and therefore I submit that the gentleman is out of order in presenting it here.

The PRESIDENT. I think that exception is well taken, and I endeavored to show to the member from Arkansas yesterday that he could not possibly accomplish his object in this House in the way in which he proposed to do it. The point just made will supersede the motion for the reading of the memorial. It is evidently not a memorial to this House, but business proposed for the action of this House by the Deputy from Arkansas, and must take its usual course.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. Very well.

The PRESIDENT. It is out of order when we are calling for petitions and memorials.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. I ask that it be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman can offer his resolution by and by, when the proper time comes. At present we are receiving petitions and memorials.

ADOPTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask permission to make a report at this time from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will receive it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution beg leave to report that they met on Saturday, the 10th of October, and organized by appointing Mr. Wolworth Secretary. That is a preliminary report.

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom, by resolution of the House, the question was referred whether the constitutional amendment set forth on page 201 of the Journal of the General Convention of 1871 was duly proposed in that Convention, and, if so proposed, whether such amendment has been duly notified to the several

Diocesan Conventions, so as to be ready now for final action by this Convention, respectfully report that the amendment in question relates to the setting apart by the General Convention of a portion of the territory of any organized Diocese too large for the Episcopal supervision of the Bishop thereof, with the consent of such Bishop and of the Diocesan Convention, and the placing of such portion under missionary jurisdiction. It was passed by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on the 25th of October, 1871, and was sent to the House of Bishops for their concurrence. On the following day, October 26, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies finally adjourned, and on the next day, October 27, the House of Bishops also adjourned, without having taken any action on the proposed amendment. In the third article of the Constitution it is provided that the acts of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies shall have the operation of laws unless the House of Bishops shall, within three days after a proposed action has been reported to them for concurrence, signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation.

"The Committee are of opinion that no act of this House can take effect as an act of the Convention by the failure of the House of Bishops to concur or non-concur within the specified time, unless this House shall continue its separate sessions the whole of that time, and that by an earlier final adjournment all acts of legislation not completed by the concurrence of both Houses fall to the ground.

"They are also of opinion that all amendments of the Constitution require the approval of two successive Conventions, and that, where an act of approval by the first Convention is incomplete as in this instance, the defect is not cured by notification to the Diocesan Conventions. Therefore, any enquiry whether such notification has been in fact made becomes irrelevant.

"On these grounds the Committee come to the conclusion that the proposed amendment to the Constitution referred to in the resolution of the House has totally failed."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. May I ask the Chairman of the Committee whether he has appended a resolution to his report, so that the matter may come up for discussion when his report is reached on the Calendar? Otherwise the House will be unable to act upon it. The usual resolution is, I believe, that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the matter. If that resolution be presented to the House, it will raise the whole question whether the House will concur with the report of the Committee or not; but if we have no resolution, that report brings up nothing for the action of the House, although the House might be of an entirely different opinion from the Committee.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The resolution referred to that Committee came to us in the form of a request for instructions from the Committee on Canons. We have given the reply that was desired. We have no resolution to offer.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Then, for the purpose of bringing the question before the House, because it does raise a very important one, I move that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject-matter, and let that go down with the report on the Calendar.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I should like to have this report and the resolution laid on the table for the present. There is other action from the same Committee on the subject-matter of this report, and when that report comes in I would like to have both acted on together. Let this be put on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. It goes there, as a matter of

course, and the Secretary will take notice of the resolution to discharge the Committee.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That will do.

FAREWELL TO THE ENGLISH VISITORS.

The PRESIDENT. I have to announce to the House that our honored guest, the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, starts for his home this evening, and is here to take a final adieu of the members of this House. The Bishop is here before you.

The members of the House rose and remained standing during the remarks of the Lord Bishop.

The LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD. My dear friends and brethren, I will not detain you long in the important business you have to transact; but I did not like, after the exceeding kindness with which we have been received here personally and in public, to leave without coming here and giving full expression in a few words to our feelings of gratitude to you all, and of the earnest love and affection with which we shall continue to regard this branch of our great Anglican Communion. I shall go back to England with my friends who have come with me, to report, as I did report three years ago, the earnest love and brotherly sympathy with which you all regard our dear old Mother Church of England. I have no doubt that that feeling of love will in time ripen into something more positive, something more systematic; but on that point, of course, great necessity for deliberation exists. But on this one respect I think I might say a word, and with regard to my own excellent friend the Metropolitan, the Archbishop of Canterbury, that nothing can be more delicate than his feelings with regard to this question which was debated, I understand, in this House yesterday. When I presented a resolution to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury to the effect that it should be proposed that the Archbishop should accept an office, by whatever name it might be called, equivalent to that of Patriarch in the ancient Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury with his own hand altered the terms of the resolution, and for that, which might have seemed of the nature of an assumption, he substituted such words as these: "That it be referred to a committee to communicate with the various branches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, to consider what should be the position occupied by the Archbishop of Canterbury amongst all these Churches in full communion with one another."

You see, then, with what delicacy this question is regarded in England by our Chief Pastor there. This, I am sure, is my own feeling. It was in that feeling that I came here to study with you what I may almost call the Newtonian law of gravitation. You are well aware that all the heavenly bodies are governed by a law, under which no one of those bodies is independent of the rest. They all revolve by the same law around the same central sun. They all have various laws by which they gravitate one towards another. It is by the same law that the moon revolves around the earth, and that the satellites of Jupiter revolve around their primary planet. It is by the same law, so far as can be ascertained, that the double and triple stars that have been discovered by powerful telescopes revolve around their common centre of gravity.

I am quite certain, then, that there is an organic connection between all the branches of our Church, though that connection be of an ethereal and spiritual kind; that it is exactly that subtle power, the most powerful force that is known, and yet altogether invisible and impalpable, yet capable of being reduced to the strictest calculation; and it is that bond of spiritual union by which we all, as believers in the same

Saviour, revolve around Him as the central sun of righteousness, and all gravitate one towards another by that feeling of brotherly love by which no man whatever can be independent of another, and by which no branch of the Church can be independent of the other branches of the same Church. That this will be our feeling more and more, and that it will expand itself into something like a definite system, I am as convinced as I am convinced that the laws of gravitation govern the whole solar system.

But, dear friends, let me assure you of this one point, that I come here in the same spirit which I share with the Archbishop of Canterbury, of putting away, in the most clear and decisive manner, the idea of our having dominion over your faith, but that we come here to be helpers of your joy. That is the feeling in which we have come. That is the feeling in which we have been received. That is the feeling, I believe, which will continue to grow among us, till all the expanding branches of the Church of England are more and more united in one great brotherhood in Christ.

With these few words, which I hope have not seriously interrupted the business of the day, I have only now to bid you all most earnestly and most affectionately, farewell.

Rev. Dr. DALZELL, of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I ask his Lordship to remain on the platform while I offer a resolution? It is that the President be requested to offer the prayer of the Church for those going to sea, for the Bishop of Lichfield and his attendant clergy; and that the Convention join in that prayer. I make that motion.

The President put the question on the motion, and it was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT read the following prayer, he and the whole House reverently kneeling:

"O Eternal God! who alone spreadest out the heavens and rulest the raging of the sea, we commend to Thy Almighty protection Thy servants, for whose preservation on the great deep our prayers are desired. Guard them, we beseech Thee, from the dangers of the sea, from sickness, from the violence of enemies, and from every evil to which they may be exposed. Conduct them in safety to the haven where they would be, with a grateful sense of Thy mercies; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Rev. Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask permission, as I was not in the House when the telegram arrived inviting the members of this House, if convenient, to attend the Congress at Stoke-upon-Trent, to say that I live and have lived for the last fifty years of my life within three miles of Stoke-upon-Trent, and my own Rural Deanery immediately adjoins that of the Rector of Stoke-upon-Trent, Sir Lovelace Stamer. Therefore, if I may look forward to the pleasure of being the means of communication for facilitating the arrival and entertainment of any members of this House, either Lay or Clerical Deputy, I shall feel it a great privilege, and hope that I myself may have some opportunity of showing some little return for those great hospitalities which I have twice received.

The Lord Bishop of Lichfield and the English clergy accompanying him retired from the House.

PETITION ON RITUAL.

Rev. Dr. GARRISON, of New Jersey. I present the petition of 67 clergy and 280 laymen, asking for a law to declare what ornaments and ritual are lawful, and what penalties shall be affixed to the transgression of those limits by defect or excess, and also for the establishment of a final Court of Appeal.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Canons.

LESSONS FOR LENT.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I wish to call the attention of the Convention to an action which took place yesterday. It is on the forty-first page of THE CHURCHMAN:

"Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut, presented a table of lessons for Lent, which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book."

This was done through forgetfulness of the fact that this matter was already in the hands of a Joint Committee of this House and the House of Bishops. To state very briefly the history of this matter, which is certainly a very important one, as I think every one of my brethren of the Clergy will agree: In 1868, a Clerical Deputy from the Diocese of Tennessee raised this subject, and it was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book of this House, with a request that they would report to that session of 1868. The Committee on the Prayer-Book reported that the subject was such as that they did not feel themselves qualified to bring in a proper report at that session, and they themselves moved that the subject be referred to a joint committee, which joint committee was appointed, consisting, on the part of the House of Bishops, of Bishop Randall, the late Bishop Eastburn, and Bishop Gregg, and on the part of this House of Rev. Dr. Haight, Rev. Dr. Thomas W. Coit, and Rev. Dr. Howe, of Pennsylvania. In 1871 this Committee desired to be continued and was continued. But since then, as we all know, Bishop Randall and Bishop Eastburn have departed this life, and Dr. Howe has been elevated to the Episcopate. Dr. Coit is no longer a member of this Convention, and Dr. Haight most unfortunately is not able to be present. But I take it, sir, that the Joint Committee still exists, and I was informed by Bishop Gregg this morning that he would move in the House of Bishops that the vacancies on the Committee on the part of that House be filled; and I move now that the vacancies in that Committee on the part of this House be filled, and I think a report can be arrived at which will be satisfactory to all, at this session of the Convention. The table which I hold in my hand is a part of the fruit of the labors of this Committee. They have not authorized it to be presented to this Convention as their report. It is a paper marked "strictly private," although I understand this very paper has been referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book. The members of the Convention will see that through misapprehension this action yesterday was all wrong, and we must recede from it, if we wish to pay proper respect to the House of Bishops and to the Joint Committee who already have it in charge.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the private table of lessons, yesterday referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book, be referred to the Joint-Committee on the subject of Lessons for Lent.

The PRESIDENT. I suppose that form of amending the matter will do, without reconsidering the action of yesterday. The motion amounts to this, that the Committee on the Prayer-Book be discharged from the consideration of that paper, and that it be referred to the Joint Committee on the Lectinary for Lent.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. I will say, in reference to that Joint Committee, as the name of Rev. Dr. Coit has been mentioned as not being a member of this House now, that he was not a member of the House when he was appointed. He was appointed not because he was a member of the House, but be-

cause he was considered to be the best-learned man in the Church on that subject; and, therefore, I should suppose he had better be continued. He is not very far from here. He can easily be present.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I was not aware of that fact, sir. Then there will be but one vacancy on the Committee to be filled. I do not wish to be appointed.

The PRESIDENT. That is not any reason why you should not be. The Chair suggests that Dr. Beach be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Committee, and the Chair will put the question on that.

The Chair put the question, and declared Dr. Beach appointed.

Rev. Dr. MEAD. I move that that Joint Committee be enlarged by the addition of two members on the part of this House. I believe the technical title of the Committee is the Joint Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book.

The motion was agreed to, and Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of Connecticut, and Rev. Dr. Hubbard, of New Hampshire, were appointed the additional members of the Committee.

TRIAL OF CLERGYMEN.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to consider and report to this House on the expediency of so amending Canon 12, Subsection 3, of Title I, of the Digest, as to provide for the case of a clergyman being charged with offences for which ministers may be tried and punished, committed prior to his removal to the Diocese to which he now belongs, but which have not been the subject of investigation or trial."

I will avail myself of the five minutes' rule simply to state a case that asks for this legislation, which I believe is admissible. A clergyman was transferred to a Diocese bringing clean papers. He was, of course, received by the Bishop. Subsequent to his receipt, grave charges were made against him, being sustained by affidavits published in the local papers. The Bishop of the Diocese in which he was received, of course, had no right to proceed to the examination and put him on trial. He could not transfer him to the Bishop of the Diocese from which he came, and that Bishop of course could not summon him back. It is a case of this kind for which legislation is sought. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I have a petition similar to that offered by the Rev. Dr. Vinton yesterday, and I move that it take the same course.

The motion was agreed to.

POSTURES IN THE COMMUNION OFFICE.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House re-enact the preamble and resolution passed at the session of the General Convention in 1829, viz.:

"Whereas, In the celebration of the Communion Office there is a variety of posture observed, and it is desirable that uniformity as far as practicable should be obtained in this respect. Therefore,

"Resolved, That this House do respectfully request of the House of Bishops the expression of their opinion as to the proper postures to be used in the said Office, with a view of effecting uniformity in that respect during the celebration."

Mr. President, that preamble and resolution are copied from the Journal of 1829, when they were

presented and passed apparently without opposition. The matter was referred to the House of Bishops, and in the Journal of the Convention of 1832, page 88, is the report that was made by the House of Bishops in response to that petition from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The consequence was that this response assumed the form of constructional law; that is to say, law so far as deference to the opinion of the Bishops is concerned in this regard. But forty-two years have now elapsed, many persons in the Church have forgotten, others probably have never heard, that such an expression of opinion had ever been made. I think that at this juncture in our Church life it is very important for us to know not only whether the Church of to-day is precisely the same as the Church of forty-two years ago, but it is very important that we should have such an expression of opinion for very many other reasons, which I cannot submit during these five minutes of explanation, which I shall be very happy to submit when the resolution comes up for discussion. I only offer it now that it may take its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will go on the Calendar.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is provided in the Constitution of the General Theological Seminary, an institution created by this body, that the Trustees of the Seminary shall present to every Convention a report of their proceedings. I hold in my hand the report which the Trustees now make to the General Convention, called the Triennial Report, which I am charged with the duty of presenting. I present it and move that it be referred to the proper Committee, the Committee on the General Theological Seminary.

The motion was agreed to.

NUMBERING OF CANONS.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I wish to have two matters go to the Committee on Canons which are necessary to be looked after for the perfection of the Digest. The first resolution is as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the figures 5 and 7 in the twelfth line of Subsection 4, of Section 8, of Canon 13, Title I, be changed to 6 and 8."

This change is rendered necessary by the fact that three years ago the so-called Theological Canons were changed, and now no reference whatever is to be found in Canons 5 and 7 of Title I, with respect to testimonials. Canons 6 and 8 declare what shall be the testimonials for persons who are to be ordained deacons and who are to be ordained priests. It is necessary therefore that this change should be made that "five" and "seven" should be changed to "six" and "eight," these two Canons being the Canons now which declare what shall be the proper testimonials in case of ordination. I move the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

PROVISIONAL BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 6, of Canon 13, of Title I, be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

This sixth section provides that "a Diocese, deprived of the service of its Bishop by a sentence of suspension without a precise limitation of time, may proceed to the election of a Provisional Bishop." I will not read the whole section; it is not necessary. This section was passed in 1850, being one of the Canons of that year, and was intended for the

relief of the Diocese of New York, its Bishop being then under suspension without any precise limit of time; and, under the provision of this section, two Bishops were elected, Bishop Wainwright and the present honored Diocesan, Bishop Potter. The sentence was passed on Bishop Onderdonk in 1844. The following General Convention of 1847 passed the following Canon, Canon 10 of Title II:

"Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms or at what time the said penalty shall cease."

The Convention of 1847 designed to prevent any such indefinite suspension again. Therefore, there never can be any further use for this section. There never can be another Provisional Bishop elected for this reason. That sentence was considered anomalous, if not illegal, and, therefore, the General Convention in 1847 passed the section declaring that the time when the suspension should cease must be stated. With the death of the late Bishop Onderdonk, all need for this section passed away. I submit that it is unnecessary to continue a Canon in our Digest for which we have no further use. I move the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

DIOCESAN SYNODS.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I wish to propose a Canon and move its reference to the Committee on Canons, and I will occupy less than five minutes in explanation. It is a Canon entitled "A Canon authorizing the Formation of Synods of Dioceses." This was the only part of the provisional system which I had in my mind when I moved, the other day, that it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to take into consideration the expediency of devising such a system. It was in order to facilitate the union of Dioceses within one State or Commonwealth in a common Synod. Certainly a difficulty has arisen whenever new Dioceses have been created whereby they have lost instead of gained in unity. This has been felt to be an evil in this State. The several Dioceses in this State have fallen apart as disintegrated fragments. They have felt less interested in each other after such division than before. Those literary institutions in which they felt a common interest have been, since the division, objects of interest to one Diocese solely. It is in order to amend our machinery for preserving such unity and identity of interests which are common among them, that I introduce this Canon. I had bestowed some thought upon it, when I found already the work done very largely to my hand by a late honored member of this House, the Honorable Murray Hoffman; and the Canon which I shall introduce is his Canon, with one provision superadded. It is entitled "A Canon authorizing the Formation of Synods of Dioceses."

The proposed Canon was referred to the Committee on Canons.

REV. DR. HAIGHT.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. Mr. President: I hold in my hand some resolutions of courtesy simply, which I had prepared early yesterday morning, and which should have been presented then, but I was unable to offer them till the present time.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

"Resolved, That this House heard on Saturday with great regret the announcement that the Rev. Dr. Haight would be unable, on account of indisposition, to perform the duty assigned him as a Deputy from the Diocese of New York.

"Resolved, That, in view of Dr. Haight's valua-

ble services during past years in the varied positions he has filled as a member of this body, we desire to make most grateful acknowledgments; and we also now tender him our deep sympathy in the Providential dispensation which deprives us of his efficient aid and counsel, while we assure him of our prayers for his speedy recovery.

"Resolved, That the Secretary furnish Rev. Dr. Haight with a copy of these resolutions."

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. I desire to add nothing to the resolutions. The simple statement that I express in these resolutions is, I am sure, the feeling of every member of this House. I would not ordinarily offer such resolutions, because I do not think they are generally necessary; but Dr. Haight's services during past years have been so long and so valuable, and his self-denial so great, that I feel, under the circumstances in which he is placed, it is due to him from us to make some acknowledgment therefor. I therefore ask the privilege of presenting these resolutions to this House.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I second the motion, if it be put, on the resolutions of the Reverend Deputy from Central New York. I think Dr. Haight well deserves this compliment. Dr. Haight entered this Convention in 1865, and was a member in 1868 and 1871. He served two sessions upon the Committee on Canons, and a most valuable member of that Committee he has been. His suggestions have been very valuable to me, and it is with deep regret that we miss him from the Committee at this time. I fully agree in the hope that this House in respect for his valuable services during the long period he has been in this Convention will pass the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Central New York. I think Dr. Haight richly merits it, though I think such a resolution might have been passed in behalf of Mr. Murray Hoffman when he left. It is never too late to do right.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move the suspension of the rules and the immediate passage of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT. If all objection is withdrawn, it is not necessary to suspend the rules.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I did not object.

The PRESIDENT. I know, but the gentleman from Louisiana, I think, did.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I will not stand against the will of the House, as a matter of course.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the resolutions offered by the Reverend Deputy from Central New York.

The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

DELEGATES FROM MISSIONARY JURISDICTIONS.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have a resolution, which I hand to the Secretary to read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved, That the standing order adopted at the General Convention of 1871, on the eighteenth day thereof, page 198, be amended by striking out the words 'directly and specially affecting their respective jurisdictions and no others, upon the motion of any member of this House,' and inserting in place thereof the words 'but not to vote,' the standing order as amended to read as follows:

"Resolved, That one Clerical and one Lay Deputy, to be chosen by any Convocation of all the clergy and representatives of the laity, convened by the authority of the Bishop of any missionary jurisdiction, within the limits of the United States, shall be entitled to have seats assigned to them in this House, and may be allowed to speak on any question, but not to vote; and that this be a standing order of

this House, and printed with its Journal at the end thereof."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. My motion is that this be referred to the Committee on Canons, and I will state the reason for the amendment. At the last session we authorized each of the Missionary Jurisdictions to send one Clerical and one Lay Deputy. In a few cases they have complied with it. I think there are three Clerical Deputies present only—the Rev. Charles R. Bonnell, from Oregon and Washington Territory; the Rev. Dr. Melancthon Hoyt, from Dakota Territory, that veteran missionary; and the Rev. Samuel D. Hinman, the missionary to the Indians, from the Missionary Jurisdiction of Niobrara. There are two Lay Deputies—one from Colorado and the other from the Missionary Jurisdiction of Niobrara.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. The Rev. Mr. Finch is here also.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. His name is not on the roll.

The SECRETARY. Not on the printed list, because he came too late; but it is on the roll of the House.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. This merely authorizes these Deputies to speak, not to vote. It has its analogy in the case of Delegates from Territories in the House of Representatives. Those who know these gentlemen, and are aware of their long experience in the Church, may feel sure that they will not be likely to trespass on the time of the House. They have valuable experience, and if we limit a large missionary jurisdiction that has a Bishop to one Clerical and one Lay Deputy, we are restricting it very much. Their Bishops have a voice in the House of Bishops; but we have virtually muzzled them here; but perhaps it was proper until we saw who came. Those who know these gentlemen, who know the value of their services and the vast experience they have had on subjects that it is very important for us to be informed upon, will be disposed to remove the restriction. This amendment merely removes the restriction, they having no vote, but the liberty to speak. My motion is that this change be referred to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. I suggest, as the pressure on the Committee on Canons is very great, that, if they take up the subjects referred to them *seriatim*, it may be a week before they come to this question; and if this compliment is to be bestowed on the Clerical and Lay Deputies from the Territories, it is desirable that they should have the opportunity at once of speaking and voting as well in the Convention.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons. The motion was agreed to.

DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNICANTS.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring). That a joint committee, to consist on the part of this House of three clergymen and three laymen, be appointed to consider and report to the General Convention what action, if any, is desirable in addition to or in explanation of the provisions already enacted by this Church for the godly discipline of its communicant members."

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. I will simply say that this resolution is the same substantially as the one which I offered in 1871 in the General Convention at Baltimore. At that Convention, however, the resolution was suffered, from my own fault, I believe, to remain on the Calendar until the very last day of the session, and then, although it passed the House of Deputies by a vote very nearly unani-

mous, it reached the House of Bishops too late for their action. I offer it now in the hope that it may meet with a better fate. I am not going to make any speech in regard to the very important subject of discipline. The question presented in my resolution is not shall we enact such or such a system of discipline; not even shall we enact any further provisions than we have; but simply to appoint a committee to enquire whether any such enactment is, in fact, needed or not, and this surely involves nothing very revolutionary.

I ask for this enquiry because it seems to me that the words in the Rubric immediately before the office for the administration of the Holy Communion, "open and notorious evil living," need definition, something supplementary in the way of specification; and this, it seems to me, is needed both for people and for clergy. As it is, if a clergyman decides in his own mind that the carrying of a gold-headed cane is "open and notorious evil living," and his Bishop agrees with him, the layman who carries such a cane may be suspended from the Holy Communion without remedy, certainly without any direct or immediate remedy. So again, on the other hand, if a clergyman attempts to exercise discipline, in cases where discipline is clearly called for, the chances are that he will be considered by some one, and probably by more than one, as acting on his own private, mistaken, perhaps wilful misconstruction of the words of the Church, and not on the Church's unquestionable authority.

Surely there ought to be some remedy for this, and a remedy, I think, there is. No one ever thinks of taking personal offence at a conductor of a street car for not turning out and giving way. He cannot do it. He must keep to the track. So I think we ought to have a track laid down for the clergy in this matter of discipline, from which they themselves could neither depart nor could any blame them for keeping to it. I will simply say that no one should for a moment think that such a system of discipline as that to which this resolution looks is anything modern or sectarian. I know that many think so. I know that many seem to think that a Church, in order to be catholic and comprehensive, must tolerate not only a very wide range of error in doctrine, but a very wide range of vice in life. Surely this was not the conception of the Catholic Church in those days when the Church was catholic indeed, and such, I trust, will not be the conception of the Catholic Church when the ultimate action comes to be taken, if so be that ultimate action shall be taken on this resolution.

The PRESIDENT. By a vote of two-thirds of the House the resolution may be at once considered. The Chair will put the question.

Two-thirds not voting in the affirmative, the resolution was not now considered, but was ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

REPRESENTATION OF DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut, submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to consider and report whether Article 2 of the Constitution ought not to be so amended as to make the representation from the several Dioceses, in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, accord in some degree with the numerical strength of the parishes, clergy, and communicants of each Diocese."

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not know that I should have offered this resolution, had not two propositions already

been referred directing the Committee to consider this second article of the Constitution.

In 1832 a motion of this kind was made, but the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies for that year did not have as careful a Secretary as we have, and therefore no record of the ultimate disposition of the matter appears.

I do not suppose that after the acknowledgment of American Independence there could have been any union of the States unless there had been a concession of rights and privileges from the larger ones to the smaller. So each State was allowed a representation in the Upper House, or the Senate, of two members, and each State might have one member in the Lower House, the popular branch, and more according to the ratio of population. It is our boast that we have framed our Constitution after that of the civil government. We have always been called a Republican Church, and we have, after the example of Congress, an Upper House, wherein each Diocese is perpetually represented by its Bishop, and a Lower House—this—composed of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The Constitution allows each Diocese to elect not more than four clergymen and four laymen. Whether it was in the mind of the Convention at the time the Constitution was framed, that the new and small Dioceses would send only one or two representatives, I know not; but now it is true that all the new Dioceses send their full delegations, four clergymen and four laymen; at least, all the seats assigned to them are fully occupied; and we have stretched the Constitution so far as to give Deputies from Territories seats on this floor, without the right of voting, but before long that thing will be asked for.

Mr. President, I desire to make a comparison of a few statistics, just to show what state we are in and what state we are likely to come to. Somehow or other these new Dioceses have a great deal of time to go into ancient matters, and they furnish to us quite as much business as the old Dioceses. They dip into Nicene matters, ancient councils, and all that sort of thing, and they come here and seem to think that the Church is represented in this country not by its members, not by its communicants, but by the number of square miles. We have had from two or three of these new Dioceses applications to have missionary jurisdictions set off from them, and before long these missionary jurisdictions will seek to be erected into Dioceses, and come here knocking at our doors for admission. Some of them will be seeking for the provincial system. One Bishop whose Diocese has less than three thousand communicants has proposed that his Diocese should be divided into sections and a provincial system adopted. Now, I wish to give a few statistics, just to show how great the disparity is in this direction—

The PRESIDENT. It will be for the House to say whether it will hear the gentleman further.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Have I taken up my full time?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I beg pardon.

The PRESIDENT. There is no Calendar now, and if the House chooses the gentleman can go on.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I will take a few moments longer if the House will indulge me.

Rev. Dr. KNICKERBACKER, of Minnesota. I move that the gentleman have leave to go on.

The PRESIDENT. It will require a two-thirds vote.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I do not ask it, then.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolu-

tion be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. PEIRCE, of Michigan. I suggest that it is always usual to let matters be referred when a reference is proposed.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I think the fact that one gentleman moved to lay the resolution on the table led a number of Deputies, including with them myself, not to vote when the Chair put the question. I think the proposed reference, as in common courtesy, ought to receive the approbation of this House. The Committee can discharge the matter summarily afterwards. I trust the vote may be again taken.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I think the motion to lay on the table is a proper motion, and that it was made in proper time. I do not wish to have a debate on this question, and I insist on my motion.

The PRESIDENT. The House can indicate its will in regard, not to the merits of the resolution, but to the question of courtesy, by the vote to lay on the table. I will put that question. The motion is that the resolution lie on the table.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion to refer was agreed to.

EXAMINATIONS FOR DEACON'S ORDERS.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware, submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be directed to enquire into the expediency of so amending Canon 4, Section 3, 'Of Examination for the Diaconate only,' in such a manner as to add to the requirements of a candidate for the deacon's orders.

"Resolved, also, That the same Committee be directed to enquire whether the requirements that pertain to the third examination for priest's orders may not be substituted for those now required of candidates for deacon's orders in Section 3, Canon 4, so that all candidates for deacon's orders be required to pass an examination in the same."

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I have simply to say that those of us who have had anything to do with the education or examination of candidates for orders are under the impression, I think, that the candidates come into the Church too easily under the requirements "for deacon's orders only," and what is meant by that I do not precisely understand. I never knew of but two "deacons only," and one of them is now a priest. They are required to have a knowledge of the Prayer-Book and of the Bible, qualifications which any respectable Sunday-school teacher possesses. The difficulty is that after they get into the ministry it is too late to correct any deficiencies or any lack of education or of requirement or qualification. Any man, after he becomes a deacon, is a minister of the Church to all intents and purposes. He can take charge of a parish, do all its work, and do almost anything except administer communion; and, if he is lacking then, you cannot turn him out, you cannot keep him back. Now I propose that the Committee be directed, instead of requiring candidates for deacon's orders to be examined only in the Bible and Prayer-Book, to require them to be examined on the third examination required of candidates for priest's orders. There is a very generally foggy atmosphere over all these Canons in regard to candidates for orders and their examinations. Things are very much mixed and not clear and distinct, and they need a general overhauling.

I will read what is required of priests in their third examination:

"The third examination shall be on Church History, Ecclesiastical Polity, the Book of Common Prayer, its history and contents, and the Constitution and Canons of this Church, and those of the Diocese to which the candidate belongs."

When the Committee report on the subject I shall have something further to say. I will not detain the House now.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

RITUALISM.

Rev. Dr. REYNOLDS, of Kansas. I hold in my hand a copy of a preamble and resolutions passed at the last Diocesan Convention in regard to Ritualism. In order that they may take their proper course to come before this House, I have a resolution to offer.

The resolution was read by the Secretary, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be requested to consider the advisability of framing and reporting to this House a Canon or Canons which shall embody the spirit of the following preamble and resolutions adopted at the last annual Convention of the Diocese of Kansas, which is hereby presented by the delegation from that Diocese."

The PRESIDENT. I suppose the Diocesan resolutions need not be read. The question is on referring this resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. I send this up to the Secretary to be read.

The PRESIDENT. Is it a resolution?

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. A resolution with a preamble.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved, That the foregoing memorial be, and is hereby, adopted by this House, and referred to the House of Bishops."

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. Now I ask for the reading of the memorial.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman asks that the memorial accompanying this resolution be read. Shall it be read?

The question was decided in the negative.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Is it a memorial to this House?

The PRESIDENT. No, it is a memorial to the House of Bishops.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. How can we adopt a memorial to the House of Bishops without considering it?

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. I ask for the reading of the paper. Then the gentleman will understand all about it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I beg to suggest that the rule that memorials and petitions shall not be read without an order does not apply to this case. It is a part of this resolution that we adopt as the sentiments of this House what is stated in that memorial to be presented to the House of Bishops. It is the gentleman's right to have his resolution—and the memorial is part of it—read before we act upon it. It is a little peculiar, to be sure; but he asks us to adopt an address to the House of Bishops in the terms there stated. Of course, that is not a memorial within any rule, but it is part of his resolution, and we never can act upon it or refer it unless it is read. I submit that he is entitled to have that read as a part of his resolution. It is not a memorial within the rule, as it is not a memorial to this House; but he asks us to adopt the words that he has put with his resolution as our sentiments, though addressed to the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. It is an anomalous case. I hope the House will cut the knot by agreeing to hear

the whole paper read. The Chair will put the question again on allowing it to be read.

The question was decided in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT. The paper will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"To the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in General Convention assembled:

"Reverend and beloved Fathers in God:

"We, the clergy and laity of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, respectfully beg leave to represent that we are anxious to come to a clear and definite understanding of the Ritual usages of the Church, in view of a great and an increasing variety of practices in the conduct of the services thereof, by which in some instances our doctrinal soundness and Apostolic character as a branch of the true Catholic Church have been called in question.

"In the providence of God, the Bishops of the Church have been placed over us as chief pastors, leaders, and superintendents of the flock, and we gladly recognize their authority, responsibility, and loving care of the interests of the whole Church, as well as the wisdom that has ever characterized our Episcopate. With a view, as we hope, of harmonizing all parties, and to set forward the prosperity of the Church, and to promote peace and good will among us, we believe that it is possible for the Bishops to present, during the session of this Convention, a scheme on the subject of Ritual that shall prove satisfactory to all parties, and become of binding force in all our Dioceses.

"We conceive that in the House of Bishops such a scheme can be originated and carried through with far greater ease and far less intensity of feeling than in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, because your House is a much smaller body, and your sessions are wholly private, and being placed at the head of the Church, and enjoying the grace of Episcopal consecration, we gladly recognize the fact that if our chief pastors are brought to unanimous agreement we shall have no difficulty in placing ourselves in harmony with your action.

"And, finally, we believe that our chief hope of bringing about a satisfactory solution of the vexed question of ritual lies at the door of the House of Bishops.

"Therefore, Resolved, That the foregoing memorial be, and is hereby, adopted by this House, and referred to the House of Bishops."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. If that resolution is proposed for adoption, I object to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a special committee be appointed by the Chair to consider and report whether the subjects of legislation now referred to one committee, to wit, the Committee on Canons, may not be classified and several committees constituted, to which they may be appropriately referred."

Mr. President, the House sees that the whole business of legislation—and it constitutes a great mass of business—has all to be ground out by one Committee. No other legislative body in existence so contrives its legislation. It seems to me a perfectly practicable scheme to classify, as in other legislative bodies, the business, so that we may have a dozen committees at work, and not pile the whole labor of our short session, because we cannot sit here long, upon one Committee.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. I suppose the resolution goes on the Calendar?

The PRESIDENT. If objected to it goes on the Calendar.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. If that

resolution is before the House I have something to say.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution is not before the House. Objection having been made to it, it goes upon the Calendar.

MINISTERS ORDAINED ABROAD.

The Rev. Dr. GARRISON, of New Jersey. I submit the following resolution :

"Resolved, That Canon 10, Title I, 'Of Ministers ordained in Foreign Countries by Bishops in communion with this Church,' line 14, after the words 'satisfactory evidence,' add the following : 'From the Bishop or ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese with which he is canonically connected, that he is a clergyman in good and regular standing in such Diocese.'"

My reason for offering this is, that it is well known to many of the clergy here that clergymen from foreign parts often come to our shores, and are allowed to minister without the requisite amount of enquiry being made as to their character or qualifications. The Canon, as it now reads, is simply "satisfactory evidence of his pious and moral character," leaving the question open as to how it is to be ascertained. I have known one sad case where a clergyman officiated for some months in a parish, who was afterwards found to have been at that time a delinquent under the laws of the Province of Canada, and was put in prison for his delinquency, there having been no proper enquiry into the matter. If we had a definite rule established that he should present letters affirming that he is a clergyman in good and regular standing, they of course would settle beyond all controversy what he is, and make the whole matter clear. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I desire leave to submit at this time a report from the Committee on Canons.

Leave was granted, and the report was read as follows :

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the subject of so amending Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, as to provide that the testimonials of Bishops-elect shall be sent to the several Diocesan Standing Committees, and the several Bishops in all cases, instead of as now, to the General Convention, when within six months of the meeting of that body, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that it is inexpedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, of the Digest."

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I move that that report be made the order of the day for Thursday, at eleven o'clock.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will go on the Calendar, of course.

COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. If the business on the Calendar is in order, I move that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Blair] be taken from the Calendar and be the first business in order.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. It lies over one day under the rule.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I move to suspend the rules, and that the resolution of the gentleman from Maryland be before the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I believe the rule says that by a vote of two-thirds we may take up any matter out of its order on the Calendar. It is not a suspension of the rule. Am I right ?

The PRESIDENT. I suppose so. It certainly requires a two-thirds vote to take it up now for consideration.

The motion was agreed to by a two-thirds vote.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Blair] is before the House.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I move to amend the resolution by adding : "The classification shall follow the same order as in the Digest—first, a Committee on the Ministry, Doctrine, and Worship ; second, a Committee on the Discipline of the Church ; third, a Committee on the Organized Bodies of the Church ; fourth, a Committee on Miscellaneous Canons."

These are the divisions of the Digest, and I should think we might adopt them without much delay, and greatly facilitate the business of the House.

Rev. Dr. REYNOLDS, of Kansas. I should like to know whether the resolution contemplates dispensing with the Committee on Canons, or substituting other Committees to perform the work which has been assigned to them. My understanding is that all these matters now go to the Committee on Canons. Is that a rule ?

The PRESIDENT. It has been the custom of this House to refer all such matters to the Committee on Canons. I think that the House has probably burdened that Committee too much by referring matters that frequently belong to the Prayer-Book Committee and to other Committees to the Committee on Canons ; but I know of no rule of the House by which that is necessary. It has only been the custom.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I hope the original resolution will pass in the form offered by the gentleman from Maryland. The amendment simply is to classify the business confided to the Committee, to be done by this House. The question to be referred by the resolution is whether it is expedient to classify the subjects now committed to the Committee on Canons, and a special committee is to be appointed to report on that subject to this House. If they think that the four great divisions existing in the Digest are the best divisions, they can so report, and the gentleman who offered that amendment can make that suggestion to the Special Committee. If the Special Committee thinks there are better or other divisions, or that it would be proper only to have these four general divisions as heads, and subdivide them, it will so report. But it is obvious that when you refer to the Committee on Canons every subject which requires a Canon or an amendment of a Canon, you refer to one Committee, as the gentleman from Maryland well remarked, the entire legislative business of this House. He contemplates that we shall subdivide that department of our business by having all laws on one subject referred to one committee, and all laws on another subject referred to another committee ; as, for instance, that laws affecting Ritual be referred to one committee, laws affecting the testimonials of clergymen to another committee ; and all the various headings of our business will then be referred to committees on those special subjects, and they will report a Canon to carry out any particular view of the House. It is obviously impossible for one committee to frame Canons to carry out every possible point of legislation which this House may wish to enact, and it is, as the gentleman well said, entirely contrary to the practice of other legislative bodies. You might as well, in the Legis-

lature or in Congress, refer to a Committee on Laws every amendment changing the laws of the land that was proposed in the House. That is what we have been doing here. It is literally that. We refer to a Committee on Laws every possible amendment and change in the laws of the Church on any subject.

I hope that this Special Committee will be allowed to take this matter untrammelled by the amendment or any instructions, and report to this House whether we can have such a division of our business as will facilitate the work of the Convention.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. Mr. President, when I wished this resolution to go on the Calendar, it was not because I was opposed to it, but I thought it necessary that action on it should be preceded by some discussion. I did not suppose gentlemen had thought of the subject much, and hence I thought it was better to have it discussed before it went to a special committee.

You have observed yourself, Mr. President, that many subjects are referred to the Committee on Canons that really ought not to go to that Committee—not to say that they might go to another Committee better, but they ought not to go to that Committee. Take, now, all changes in the Prayer-Book, all orders for altering the mode of worship, or amending any part of the Rubrics of the Prayer-Book. Those ought to go to the Prayer-Book Committee. The Canons cannot help those matters; they cannot produce a Canon to amend them. Now, you have a Committee on the Prayer-Book. Why not refer every subject that comes up relating to the Prayer-Book to that Committee?

Then that Committee, who now have hardly anything to do, would find itself with enough to do. Not only so, but even that Committee is too general. Gentlemen have pointed out that the Committee on Canons was too general. So the Committee on the Prayer-Book is too general. Let any one take up the Prayer-Book, and he will see that there are three great divisions at least, if not more, which ought to be made, and for each one there ought to be a separate branch of the Prayer-Book Committee, if not a separate committee. You would naturally refer to one committee everything that affected the Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, the Occasional Prayers, and the Occasional Offices. Let these go to one Committee. They will have enough to do with them, and then they can do effectually what is to be done in that respect. Then take the Sacraments. A Committee on that subject, every one can see, would be a most important Committee. They would, perhaps, have less to do, and yet they would have heavier work, more important work. Then the third would be on the Lectionary and Psalter. This division I have known to be made actually, and to have worked well.

It is true the titles to our Canons would indicate a proper division; but I do not know that you could make as many subcommittees as there are titles in our Digest of Canons, but still that is a very good indication of how the Committee on Canons might be divided. The idea has hitherto been that almost everything we could do was to be done by a Canon. You have broken that up in a great measure. When you have appointed a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution you have taken a great burden from the Committee on Canons, and none but those who have been on that Committee know what that burden was. There is now left to them as much as any committee can bear; and how the Committee on Canons could have stood under the labor they have had heretofore is almost inconceivable. Instead of finding fault with their dilatoriness, the wonder has been how they have ever got through at all, for really it stands just

as if any one of our legislative bodies had a Committee on Acts, and required every act to go to them. The mischief at present is worse, because of the habit of referring so many subjects to the Committee on Canons. I am ready to say that if it were now proper to go back to the records of that Committee, you could withdraw from them and give to other Committees perhaps one-third of what has been referred to them.

I take the opportunity to make these remarks because I believe it is very important that some arrangement should be made on this subject. I should be happy to have the Committee on Canons divided into sections. You do not want a full committee for each section, but you probably want nine in each division. I would take the Committee on the Prayer-Book in the same way and divide that into sections. I believe by doing this you would get through the business of this Convention in half the time you now do.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, I suppose that a large portion of the business of this House has already been launched in various committees, and it would be almost impracticable now, without prolonging the session of the General Convention, to subdivide and split up "twixt North and Northwest side" all the various subjects and reallot them to new and inexperienced committees. I think it probable that a carefully-arranged subdivision of labor, prospective in its character, might be, after much careful and painstaking deliberation, adopted; but I really think that it is too late for this session of the General Convention. But on the general proposition, this resolution contemplates in effect the destruction of the Committee on Canons. Of course, sir, if the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky, offered as an amendment, be followed, the Committee on Canons will go by the board. We shall have a Committee on Orders in the Ministry, a Committee on Discipline, a committee on this subdivision and on that subdivision; but the venerable old Committee on Canons, with my distinguished friend from Connecticut at its head, will be laid upon the shelf as an old-fogy memory of the past, no longer to be revered among us. I for one am opposed to any action of this House that would dissolve that venerable committee which has been the organ of the legislative purposes of this House for scores and scores of years. And, sir, while members on the floor seem to express profound sympathy with that Committee in the labor it has to undergo, I do not know that members of the Committee have themselves expressed any great sense of injustice or burden by reason of the duties devolved upon them. And it seems to me that, if there be some obstruction in the way of the progress of new ideas and new schemes of legislation arising from the necessity of everything affecting the canonical law of this Church passing through the Committee on Canons, which is a break-water, and at the same time a drift-net to catch improper things that may creep into general legislation, it is an evil that a great conservative Church ought rather to covet than to seek to get rid of.

John Randolph once said that the great bane of modern legislative bodies is to be found in subdivided facilities for multitudinous legislation; and I consider one of the great safeguards of this House to consist in the matured experience, the life-long devotion of the members of the Committee on Canons, to the great interests of the Church, which have in successive epochs been addressed to the consideration of that Committee. Lay my venerable friend from Connecticut [Rev. Dr. Mead] aside, and you close a great library, as it were—a treasure-house of knowledge, which, when any subject affecting the Canons of this Church is

brought before that Committee, is not only poured forth for the enlightenment and instruction of the Committee, but when the subject comes before this House is at the service of the House and the Church at large.

Now, sir, I feel that this will be a "new departure" in the legislative history of our Church, the end of which will be that we shall have scattered over this House dozens, it may be, of committees, with inexperienced men upon them, and crudely prepared legislation will be brought forward for the consideration of the House. In a body so large as this, in an assembly of three hundred-odd members, there must be great confidence in the committees that report measures for the consideration of the House. And, whilst I do not undertake to say that other committees cannot be organized which would be as conservative, as experienced, as learned as the members of the Committee on Canons, yet I do say that on that Committee are now found men who, from their previous knowledge and experience, have acquired valuable information, which this House ought not to disperse and scatter all over it in other committees.

I say, sir, that the question now is, Will you dissolve the Committee on Canons, or will you preserve that Committee? At least, let us allow that Committee to stand during the rest of this session, and sleep over the matter until another session of the General Convention.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for a recess has arrived, and the House will take a recess until two o'clock.

At two o'clock P.M. the House resumed its session.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, as the House is not yet entirely full so as to proceed with the business pending at the recess, will you accept a motion to increase a committee?

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will entertain it.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the Joint Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book on the part of this House be increased by the addition of Rev. Charles R. Hale; and I name the gentleman for this reason: Mr. Hale is perfectly competent; he has been a great deal with our friend, Dr. Haight, in the preparations, so far as they have extended, and he would be a most important member of that Committee, as our own members of the Committee are new men on the whole subject. I therefore move that Rev. Mr. Hale, not a member of this House, be placed on that Committee. Dr. Coit, also not a member of this House, is already on the Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. I will also give notice to the House that I have received information that the Rev. Dr. Scott, of Florida, will not be in this House during its present session, and I appoint in his place upon the Committee on the State of the Church the Rev. Mr. Thackara, from the same Diocese.

COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the resolution offered by Mr. Blair, of Maryland, this morning.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution now pending before the House. It is to strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert:

"That a special committee of nine be appointed by the President, to which the Committee on Canons may refer such matters as it may deem necessary to expedite its business, the action of the Special Committee to be reported directly to this House."

I offer this amendment because I am satisfied from conversation with several members of the

House that the original resolution is distasteful to them. The honorable member from Virginia, Judge Sheffey, has expressed very nearly my views, but not exactly. I think it may be necessary that the Committee on Canons should have some relief in the amount of business they have on hand, and they are the best judges of this matter. I propose to leave it to them to decide whether they want any relief or assistance whatever in the transaction of their business. If they do, then there will be a committee of nine members, appointed by the President, to whom they may at their pleasure refer such business as they desire to get rid of.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, it seems to me that this resolution which was offered by the gentleman from Maryland is one of great importance, and I was very sorry indeed to hear the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Virginia upon it. What was that resolution? Simply a resolution to appoint a committee of enquiry as to whether the business before the Committee on Canons can be classified and divided, and a part of it go to some other committee. On that question I suppose no one will doubt but that one-half—I think I may safely say two-thirds—of the important business coming before this Convention goes to that Committee. Why so? Because that Committee is the Committee on Legislation, and it so happens, and, as was explained here yesterday, that legislation pertains to three different branches which come before us—on the Constitution, on Canons, and on the Rubrics of the Prayer-Book. Now, how does it happen that all this business accumulates before the Committee on Canons? It seems to me very natural. A member presents a resolution on some subject that pertains to legislation. Without reflection as to whether it concerns the Constitution, or the Prayer-Book, or Canons, the impulse in perhaps two-thirds of those who present these resolutions is immediately to refer them to the Committee on Canons. I think it so happens that this Committee beyond any question has been overburdened with work, as we have seen for every Convention that has met.

Now, sir, I say that I was surprised at the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Virginia. Why? He says that this resolution is a blow struck at the Committee on Canons. How does that appear? I am not on the inside of the motives of the gentleman who offered that resolution. I do not know but that he had an idea to disturb in some way the Committee on Canons. If such was his idea, I think I am safe in saying that no member of this House sympathizes with him; but I assert such was not the purpose of the resolution. There is nothing in the language of it that implies such a purpose, and I ask—

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, I was induced to make those remarks by reason of the distinct proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky by way of amendment of the pending proposition, to indicate the subdivision of subjects to be referred to these new committees, and if by Titles I, II, III., or by subdivisions of those Titles, you ran through the entire subjects of legislation, where would the Committee on Canons be? I say that it is an inevitable result, if the suggestion of my friend from Kentucky were followed, that these new committees would necessarily expel the Committee on Canons from its position as a committee, because there would be then three or four classes of committees, with separate subdivisions of subjects referred to them.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I hear the explanation of my honorable friend from Virginia,

but I fail to see how the conclusion that he has deduced from it follows; for I ask again what is this resolution? Simply one of enquiry whether the business of the Committee on Canons can be so classified and arranged that any other committees in this House can attend to it for them. Now, I pretend to say that if that can be done, it is "a consummation most devoutly to be wished," not from any fault of the Committee on Canons, however.

The gentleman says that they have not asked for this relief. True, sir, they have not, and I do not know but that it would have been a little more polite for my friend from Maryland to have waited until they did ask for it; but I am afraid that if he had waited till that time he never would have had the opportunity of presenting his resolution. While I admit that the members of the Committee on Canons, which embraces the best talent that we have in this Church, have ably performed their duty in regard to all business committed to them; and I for one am prepared to say that perhaps the whole business of the Church might be committed to them; and I do not know but it would be better done than it is at present. But I do recognize the fact that there are other committees in this House that embrace some talent and that are not overburdened with work, who are willing to do any work committed to them.

In regard to the amendment just offered, I have to say that I am opposed to that *in toto*, for that amendment proposes merely to leave the whole subject where it is now—to wit: if the Committee on Canons see fit to delegate any of their business to any other committee, it shall be done. Now, our honorable friend from Virginia says that they are not overburdened with business, and that they do not propose to delegate any of their business. I do not care who does the business of this Committee; but it is true, as gentlemen who have been in this Committee for the last fifteen years know, that the business of the Committee on Canons has been further behind than that of any other Committee; not from any fault of the Committee; they are the hardest-working Committee, beyond all question, of any Committee in this House; but they are overburdened.

The question simply is, Shall a committee be appointed to enquire, simply to enquire, if a part of their duties can be devolved on any other Committee. It seems to me that ordinary courtesy would allow such a resolution to pass without debate; much less should I suppose that the members of the Committee itself would be the ones to object to a committee of this kind. Sir, I am in favor of appointing this special committee. Whether it will result in anything practical or not, remains to be seen. I do not know that it will, but clearly in my mind the enquiry will do no harm. An able committee appointed simply to enquire and report, certainly can do no harm, and it seems to me that, as I say, it is a matter of courtesy alone. This Committee should be suffered to be appointed, and we should hear their report, because if this business is going on as it has, year after year, Convention after Convention, increasing largely on the Committee on Canons, we are going to come to a point some time, when even, although they might be almost omnipotent, they could not do all the business, and it seems to me not improper to consider it at this time.

I am therefore, sir, in favor of the appointment of that Committee unqualifiedly, and I trust the House will appoint it.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of the Standing Committees of this House of the General Convention. I speak to the amendment to the amendment, which calls for the appointment of a committee to which, at its option, the Committee on

Canons may confide such work as it thinks proper. Now, sir, is that to be a subordinate committee or a co-ordinate committee? Is it to appear among the Standing Committees on this register, or is it to be a Committee which shall hide itself under the protecting wings and the directing power of the Committee on Canons? I think there is some explanation necessary before the House can venture to accept the amendment.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. All the explanation necessary is stated in the amendment itself. It says distinctly that the action of that committee shall be reported directly to this House. It is not, therefore, a subordinate committee. It is a committee appointed to do the work which the Committee on Canons finds itself unable to do; and when this business is transferred to that special committee, it is then to be acted upon by that committee and reported by the special committee directly to this House.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. The Committee on Canons, however, is to confide the work to that committee, and direct it what it shall do, to cut out certain work for it. It does not stand as a co-ordinate committee under those circumstances.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I have very little to say on this subject, and I should have said nothing had it not been made a personal matter by one gentleman who spoke intimating that there was some feeling on the part of the Committee on Canons in relation to this question. Sir, as a member of that Committee of several years' standing, and as Chairman of that Committee, I had no feeling at the motion made by the gentleman from Maryland—not the least. I could have wished that that motion had prevailed at once, because then the Committee on Canons would have been consulted, of course, by the special committee appointed to consider and report as to whether they needed the assistance proposed.

Sir, I have no feeling on that subject. I have feeling, however, on this subject: The whole of this debate on the part of those who advocate the taking away of certain duties from the Standing Committee on Canons goes, necessarily and naturally I admit, on the presumption that the Committee on Canons have too much to perform. I would ask the Secretary of the House if ever the House has adjourned with anything remaining, to his knowledge, on the Calendar of the Committee on Canons which had not been reported to this House.

The SECRETARY. No, sir.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. This, remember, was before we asked, as we did at this session, that you should divide our duties. I have long felt that on one important matter, that of amendments to the Constitution, we wanted the best legal minds in the Convention on that Committee; and when I looked around and saw the wisdom embodied in the laity here, I felt that on amendments to the Constitution it would be wise in us not to continue that additional burden upon the Committee on Canons, but to appoint a committee for that special purpose. The House has generously granted it, and the Chair has appointed a most judicious committee, taking it as a whole. So far we are relieved from duties which we have never shrunk from, never failed to report upon, and I must say in defence of the Committee on Canons, as having been for many years its Chairman, that I defy any man to assert that that Committee on Canons has been derelict in its duty or has not perfectly fulfilled it.

Gentlemen rise and make their propositions, and then move that they be sent to the Committee on Canons. If I hear them, and I do not think the duty proposed is germane, I say "that be-

longs to the Committee on the Prayer-Book," for instance, "and I move that it be referred to that Committee." I have endeavored, and other members of the Committee on Canons have endeavored, to do that, and to prevent the reference to our committees of subjects that belong to other committees. We have a great deal of business on our hands now unquestionably, but it is apparent rather than real. Large circulars are committed to us on certain subjects which have been very much agitated and mooted by the public, who suppose we are going to be split into ten thousand pieces by these subjects; but I do not believe we shall lose a hair by them.

Under these circumstances, till the Committee on Canons, as now subdivided by the addition of a Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, cry, "You are giving us too much to do; we cannot do it," or until your Calendar shows that we are negligent in our duty, we beg you not in any degree to reflect upon us.

I know full well that the discharge of the duties of a committee depend very much upon the activity, and system, and energy of its chairman. I am an aged man, not very active, but I believe that some persons in this House think my mode of driving business ahead in the House would be more honored in the breach than the observance.

Still it is my nature, and while I am on that Committee, I promise you that everything sent to us shall be brought back to you again, either matured or to ask you to refer it to another committee. Why, then, should you undertake to interfere with a Committee which, at its own suggestion, you have already divided, to make another, and another, and another subdivision?

I have nothing more to say. I shall not serve on the Committee again, and therefore I have felt free to say what I have said.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to offer a substitute for the original resolution and the two amendments:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be enlarged by the addition of eight members, to the end that they may create from their number subcommittees, to consider special subjects referred to them by the House."

Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. I move that the whole subject, the resolution, together with the substitute and amendment, be laid on the table.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That motion cannot be made while I am on the floor.

The PRESIDENT. Of course not. The gentleman from Western New York is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. My object in offering this substitute is manifold. First, there is no intention by any of those propositions to reflect in any way whatever upon a Committee who, I believe, possess the largest confidence of this entire House, as well as its respected and venerable Chairman; nor is it altogether to relieve that Committee of the onerous duties imposed upon them, although they might well be willing to have their labors divided among others. The object of this proposition is, first, that the business of the Committee may be relieved and distributed among a larger number; and, secondly—and it is an important point—that there may be a larger representation on that Committee of this House, which has within its scope the entire legislation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, so far as this House is concerned.

The office of a Committee on Canons, if the original resolution shall be adopted, and the Special Committee should report subcommittees, to whom

we could refer matters, would be reduced to this: If committees on special subjects were created by this House, the matter referred to them would be, "Do we desire or do we need such a measure?" and the Committee would be directed to enquire into the expediency of the measure, which is wholly irrespective of the form of law in which it should be put; and having through that Committee reached the mind of this House as to whether we do or do not wish that measure, we act accordingly. If we do wish the measure accomplished, it may be necessary to refer it to the Committee on Canons to put it in proper shape as legislation. If we do not wish it accomplished, it is not necessary for them to consider it at all.

The Committee on Canons are not merely a committee to frame laws or Canons to carry into effect the wishes of this House, but they have the very grave duty and the very responsible duty of reporting to this House whether it is expedient to have a Canon on any particular subject, and of course that jurisdiction of the Committee embraces the subjects-matter of the entire business of this Convention, so far as the enactment of laws for the Church is concerned.

I, for one, was very much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Sheffey] as to the necessity of the conservative influence of a committee of their dignity and ability; and it is for that reason that I have abandoned my support of the original resolution, and now prefer to leave the whole matter still in the hands of the Committee on Canons, enlarged so as to embrace a greater representation of this House, and, at the same time, enable them to do to a greater extent what they are now doing, as I understand—referring matters on different subjects to subcommittees created by themselves, exercising a general supervision over the whole, and bringing them here by the general report of the whole.

The difference between this motion and the motion which immediately preceded it to create a special committee of nine, to whom the Standing Committee could refer any matter, lies in this: that when the Standing Committee would refer a matter to a special committee of nine, they would lose any control or supervision over it, and we should lose the benefit of their wisdom in supervising the action of that committee. Under the proposed substitute, whatever is referred to subcommittees must pass muster through the whole Committee before it can receive final sanction and be reported to this House as the action of the Committee, and it seems to me it will serve all the purposes that can be accomplished by subcommittees appointed in any other way.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. Mr. President, I fully accord with the Deputy from Western New York, who has just taken his seat, in the proposed amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maryland; but I apprehend there is only one way to accomplish that purpose, and that is by giving one day's notice of an amendment of the fourth rule of this House, which provides for certain Standing Committees, to consist of thirteen members.

I believe that every member of this House who has had experience in legislative bodies will agree with me when I say that in almost all legislative bodies a very large share of the work done by those bodies is first referred to one or two of the many committees of those respective bodies. For example, the Judiciary Committee of almost any legislative body reports more business for the action of that body than almost all the other committees; and the Committee on Canons in this House corresponds almost precisely with the Judiciary Committee of a legislative body. I believe

that the time may come when it will become desirable—necessary, even—to divide the Committee on Canons perhaps into two or three committees; but at this stage of this Convention it would be almost suicidal. I accord therefore with the gentleman from Western New York in believing that the best way to relieve the Committee on Canons, who are certainly overburdened by work, is by increasing the number of that Committee; but to accomplish that, I think the gentleman will agree with me in saying, requires one day's notice, in compliance with the twenty-eighth rule of order, which is:

"No amendment of these rules shall be made unless one day's notice shall have been given of the motion to amend; and no rule shall be suspended unless with the assent of two-thirds the members present." Then the fourth rule reads: "At the opening of the session the President shall appoint the following Standing Committees," and among these is the Committee on Canons, "each to consist of thirteen members." I submit, therefore, that the only way to accomplish the object is by giving notice to-day of a proposed amendment to Rule 4.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That is so if the point of order is insisted upon; but a great many things pass a little out of order by general consent. If anybody raises the point of order, it avails; but if the House do the thing, it is done.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. But we had better do things in the legal way according to our rules. It is not worth while for us to take proceedings not in accordance with the rules, as it seems to me. I say again, however, that I quite accord with the view expressed by the Deputy from Western New York.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If the point of order is made, I shall be compelled to give notice of my amendment to the rules; but if the point is not made, the action of the House is just as legal as if the notice had been given.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I shall detain the House by but a very few remarks on this subject. I would say first that I regard all the amendments which have been offered as out of order. The amendment of my friend from Kentucky is not germane at all, because this, as has been truly said by the gentleman from Minnesota, is merely a resolution of enquiry. It is a resolution to appoint a committee to enquire whether it be expedient to do a certain thing. The gentleman from Western New York and the gentleman from Louisiana propose to amend that resolution of enquiry by a positive enactment. That is not germane to it. So with the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky. I do not propose to legislate at all. They do; and therefore they are entirely out of order. I think nothing can be clearer than that proposition. I think the members of the House must all be sensible that none of the propositions which have been offered by way of amendment to my resolution can be entertained, and therefore I come back to say a few words—and a very few words indeed they shall be—upon the original proposition.

There is a great misconception about it by my learned friend from Virginia, and by the reverend gentleman at the head of the Committee on Canons. I never have been engaged; I shall not be here engaged in any special legislation. I do not bring this matter in for the purpose of affecting any man or anything that is now pending before the House. It seems to me, with this great and growing interest that we have charge of, when we have a Church expanding

all over the country, that the clothes which were large enough for it in its beginning may not be now. This Committee on Canons, when ours was an early institution, might have been all-sufficient to attend to the various legislation which this Church in its infancy required; but we know now that great questions, questions of absorbing interest, are continually multiplying, and will continue to multiply, in so large and influential a body as this has become throughout the land, and therefore we must look not to to-day. The resolution did not contemplate, and I would not have any business now referred to the Committee on Canons taken from it. But in the absence of any Committee on Rules, what are we to do? We must have a special committee to take charge of new rules, and to consider whether, in the growing legislation which such a body as this requires, other committees may not be appropriately established to enable us to do our business properly and in order.

The gentleman says, and says with truth, that the Committee on Canons have done their work, and done it well. I have no complaint on that point; but every man who is at all conversant with the nature of the enquiries now to be made, and that will hereafter be made, knows that one committee cannot make them all. For instance, we have now one single question which is enough for this Committee to attend to in the short time we have here. We ought to have that question before us now. It is the commanding question before the country. How long will it take them to reach it? It has not been reached yet, that I know. We may have the spectacle presented here of our convening in the face of this country with a question that has excited the country as it never has been excited heretofore, not reached because we have a certain accumulation of work upon this Committee! Conservative as the Committee is, there are others also conservative. Although a new man here, I hold myself as the representative of a conservative Church, and our people want some voice through me and my colleagues on this floor in the great questions before the Church, and we want to have it whether we are new men or old men, and we want to have it as speedily as it can be had.

So far from it tending in the least to prevent that due investigation of questions which ought to be had by appropriate organs, the way, as everybody knows, to secure the proper investigation of questions is by the subdivision of labor. It is no reflection at all, and I certainly did not intend any reflection upon the Committee of Canons. I am the last man that would be guilty of such a thing, and especially upon my learned friend from Virginia. He seems to suppose that because I am a new man in this body, I have come here to supersede him in his functions. No, sir. I come here to follow him—I come to obey his lead so far as I can consistently with the duty I owe my constituents whom I represent in this body. I have no such thought as that of superseding him because I am a new man, nor am I a destructive, as he seems to suppose every man must be who undertakes to interfere with the existing organization of the committees of this House.

I hope the Convention will meet the question simply and plainly as put in the resolution; it is not a very grave one, and if the proposed committee should do anything revolutionary, when its report is made that will be time enough to call it by these hard names, or to suggest that something of that sort is contemplated. I disavow in every respect having contemplated any such thing. I consulted with the most experienced and best informed advisers in this body, and I had the sanction of the best advice in the body when I did present the resolu-

tion. Now, if it meets the views of the Convention, let it be adopted; if not, let it be voted down. I feel no sort of concern about it.

Rev. Mr. MARKS, of Mississippi. Mr. President, until the Committee on Canons asks some relief I think no legislation is necessary on the part of this House; and for that reason, as I conceive that the House is ready for a vote, I move that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The next business is the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons, relative to Canon 4, Title II.

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 3, of Canon 4, of Title II, be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop made in pursuance of such recommendation, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial function within the Diocese, until he shall retract his refusal; or, if the Vestry or congregation shall refuse to comply with any such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention, until they shall have retracted their refusal."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I have been requested by the Chairman of the Committee to present their action in this matter and to explain it. The subject was referred to the Committee by two resolutions from this House, one coming originally from the Diocese of Massachusetts, and another from the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey (Rev. Dr. Farrington); that from Massachusetts asking that the Committee should take the whole Canon into consideration and report, if any, and what changes might be desirable in it. The Clerical Deputy from New Jersey asked a specific change, that the words "Bishop and," in the third section of the Canon, should be omitted upon the ground that thereby this section would be brought into more perfect consistency with the other sections of the Canon. To explain this, let me refer the House to the action of the General Convention of 1871, at which time this Canon was passed.

The matter was referred to the Committee on Canons at that time on the motion of a Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania. A report was brought in by the Committee, in which a board of reference was proposed to act in the cases for which the Canon is intended to provide—"Of Differences between Ministers and their Congregations, and of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection"—by which arrangement the board was to consist of the Bishop and five Presbyters. That was the Canon as reported to the House, and accepted by them and sent to the House of Bishops. You will find the report on the two hundred and fifth page of the Journal of 1871. The House of Bishops, by their Committee on Canons, recommended certain alterations, which are to be found on page 372 of the Journal of 1871. Among those alterations was this, "That the words 'Bishop and' should be stricken out" of several places in the Canon, not in that section, the object of the Committee on Canons in the House of Bishops being undoubtedly to make the Board of Reference to consist exclusively of the five Presbyters, these Presbyters then to make a recommendation to the Bishop of the Diocese, upon which recommendation the Bishop was to act

in conjunction with that Board of Presbyters. That left the section standing as it does now upon the Digest of 1871: "If any rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the recommendation of the Bishop and Presbyters, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him," etc.

It is thought there is an inconsistency in retaining the words "Bishop and" in this section, whereas they had been excluded from the previous ones; but the Committee on Canons thought that there was an intentional change made; that it was intended that, in the first place, the Board of Reference should consist exclusively of the Presbyters appointed, but that, when it came to the actual recommendation and to carrying into effect the recommendation, that should be done by the Bishop and Presbyters, that the Bishop would come in by virtue of his own office in the act. They, therefore, thought that the change proposed was not only not demanded by consistency, but was contrary to one of the principles of the Church, because it would have made the recommendation of the Presbyters directly binding upon the recalcitrant clergyman without the intervention of the Bishop. The Committee on Canons, therefore, rejected the change proposed by the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey.

But furthermore, the Canon as a whole was committed to the Committee to report what changes they might think desirable in it. Taking this section into consideration, they supposed that it would be better to express a little more definitely the position of the Bishop himself in the matter, and at the same time to avoid the anomaly of appointing a penalty upon a clergyman for refusing to obey a recommendation merely. They therefore propose, in the language which has been read to you just now by the Secretary, to substitute this for the section as it stands upon the Digest of 1871. This is the only change the Committee propose to make in this Canon at present:

"If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop, made in pursuance of such recommendation, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial function," etc.

You will perceive that the Bishop's approval of the recommendation is required, and then, if the minister refuses to comply with the requirement of the Bishop made in pursuance of the recommendation, the penalty is to be inflicted. This is, I believe, the substance of the Committee's reason for proposing the alteration which has been sent in.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to, and I believe the Convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts would agree very well with, this alteration which has been proposed by the Committee on Canons; but I think the alteration does not touch the substance of the Canon sufficiently, and does not touch the points which probably influenced the Convention of Massachusetts in proposing the resolution which they did propose. I am not prepared at the present moment to speak definitely upon it; but I should like to look a little more into the subject. I will therefore move that the report be laid upon the table, and I will promise to call it up at some future time.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. May I be allowed to say a word?

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I think I represent the Committee correctly when I say that there being no definite proposition coming with the reference from Massachusetts, and being unable to

have anything more than an incidental knowledge of what might be their motive, it was almost impossible for us to act upon it.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. That is perfectly true; but some of the Deputies from Massachusetts had hoped they would receive notice of a session of the Committee, and would be permitted to attend, to present some matters connected with this Canon.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. We were not aware of that.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. No such invitation was extended; and hence we have been obliged to wait until the report should be presented, thinking that possibly the Committee might see the same objections which have been seen by others, and propose to correct them. If the Committee make no objection, I should be glad to have the resolution laid on the table at present, to be taken up at some future time.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Would it not be better to recommit it? There are grave objections to the Canon as it stands. I think if it were recommitted, and those objections heard, the Committee might change the Canon.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. There is a single suggestion which I should like to throw out for the consideration of the Committee on Canons, if this matter goes back to them, if they have not already considered it. If I caught the language of the Canon as reported, correctly, in a certain contingency it proposes to disfranchise a parish. The question I should like to suggest is whether the representation of a parish is not a constitutional right, and if it be so, whether it can be abridged or taken away by canonical legislation. It may be that the Committee on Canons have considered this point; but if they have not, I desire to call their attention to it, in case the subject is recommitted.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I can state to the gentleman that that matter was not brought before this present Committee, but I think it was before the Committee of 1871 who introduced that provision.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. With the consent of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I move to recommit this matter to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. I think the question I have suggested ought to go to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Probably the object which the gentlemen have in view by recommending this Canon would be better reached by letting the report come up when it is called up, and when these gentlemen will be prepared to discuss it, and then let it be debated before the House, and recommitted with such instructions as the House may think proper. Then the Committee will understand the feeling of the House, and by this course we shall probably avoid two discussions upon the same subject. Of course it will be the duty of the Committee on Canons to obey the instructions which the House may finally, on the presentation of the views of the gentlemen who have spoken on this Canon, agree to.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. If there is to be a Canon, the matters that I wish to bring before the Committee I prefer to bring before the Committee alone in the first place. Upon conference with the Chairman of the Committee I find that we shall be invited before that Committee at its next meeting, and I hope the House will recommit the subject and allow us to be heard by the Committee. I think if the reasons were laid before this House they would see the propriety of this course. Already matters have arisen under this Canon that I do not desire to bring before this Convention, but do desire to bring before the Committee; and then

a Canon framed after these facts are known to the Committee, I am satisfied, will be acceptable to the Convention without their knowing the exact facts.

Rev. Mr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I rise to express the hope that this matter may be recommitted for the same reason given by the Deputy from Texas. Difficulties have arisen in the Diocese of Kentucky under this Canon which it is not necessary to specify here, but which might be stated before the Committee on Canons, and which would show them that there is reason why the Canon should be amended otherwise than in the way already proposed.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Is it necessary to recommit this report to the Committee on Canons? Why cannot this amendment be passed, since it seems to have received general approbation, and then let any other proposed amendment to the Canon be referred to the Committee on Canons?

The PRESIDENT. I suppose it is deemed better to act upon the whole subject together.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. If the proposals which are to come from Massachusetts and from Texas are contradictory of that which has already been done, then of course the whole matter had better be recommitted; but, as it appears that they are not contradictory of what has been reported by the Committee, I ask again, Why send that back to the Committee? Why not pass what the Committee recommend, if you approve of it, and then let the other subject be sent to the Committee?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I want to say that the late Bishop Armitage, of Wisconsin, was so completely convinced of the unfairness of this Canon in all its essential matters that he would not act under it. Why should there be such legislation as this? There is a dispute between a minister and his congregation. That dispute *prima facie* cannot be a moral dispute for which the minister is tried, but it must be a dispute under which he is incapable of being tried; and what legislation have we?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. The motion before the House is to recommit, and it is not debatable.

The PRESIDENT. It is not debatable, and I intend to so decide.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Then I move to recommit, with instructions to the Committee to substitute for this whole Canon the old Canon of 1832.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise again to the question whether this subject is debatable.

The PRESIDENT. I think that the motion to recommit with instructions is debatable.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. My motion is to recommit, with instructions to the Committee to substitute for this present Canon the old Canon, No. 34, of 1832. Such legislation as this—that the contending parties should nominate a certain number of Presbyters, and that the number should be reduced to five by striking off—is the most uncertain of anything. It falls to reason that this matter, not being a question of morality, the contending parties simply nominate those Presbyters who they think are most favorable to themselves, and then, when they come to strike off, each strikes off those that he thinks most hostile to himself. The consequence is that the whole thing is left in the hands of the Bishop and his three Presbyters. The old Canon that we had was a Canon under which the Bishop issued his notice to all the clergy of the Diocese, and they assembling made a board in which the Presbyter had a chance of fair treatment in every way. How this original Canon was repealed no man knows. It was at the tail of the Convention of 1859, when a great portion of the men who were

interested in the matter had gone, and some one gets up and says he has no great objection to that Canon, because Dr. Hoffman said it was very good and a beneficial Canon on the whole, but he thought it was not perfect, and so he proposed to repeal it, and it was repealed, and we were left without any light upon the point at all. Then by and by, a few years afterwards, this new Canon was added, and by this Canon the whole weight is put against me, while under the old Canon the trial, if it could be called such, was by my fellow-Presbyters, and I had some chance of fairness, but under this Canon, I have no chance of fairness at all, and every man that looks at the thing and goes over its provisions must see that it is nothing but a weapon put in the hands of any one who chooses to silence an individual Presbyter of a Diocese. It is simply a contrivance to get rid of a man against whom a person may have a quarrel.

I move that this subject be referred back to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to substitute for it bodily the old Canon 34 of the year 1832.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I understand that the Chair has decided that the motion to commit with instructions allows something further to be said.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Permit me to rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair to reconsider that decision, from the very fact that, if a motion to recommit can be amended by a motion to recommit with instructions, we might as well have no rule at all on the subject, because it opens up the whole question; and all that a member has to do in order to throw the whole matter before the House, and do away with the rule, is simply to add to the motion to recommit certain instructions which may occur to him at the moment.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I would be glad if Dr. Adams would withdraw that amendment.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I would ask if any one has seconded my motion? [Laughter.]

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. The instructions not being seconded are not before us.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I think we ought to have a decision of the Chair on the point I have stated, as it is an important one, and the precedent is important.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to have his judgment informed on that question whether a motion to recommit with instructions is debatable.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is not the point I make, but whether, when a motion to recommit has been made, any motion to amend it can be made; whether the House must not be brought to a vote without debate. If they recommit it, the matter is not before the House; if they refuse to recommit it, then a motion will be in order to recommit with instructions, but you cannot have a motion to recommit amended.

The PRESIDENT. Will some of the learned gentlemen upon rules of order enlighten the mind of the Chair upon that point?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I do not see that that question is legitimately before us. The motion to recommit with instructions was not seconded, and the question simply stands on my motion to recommit generally.

The PRESIDENT. Then, of course, the other question need not be decided now. It will be decided hereafter when it arises. The question is on the motion to recommit the report to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW DIOCESES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. The next business is the re-

solution reported by the Committee on Canons upon the proposed amendment to Section 2, of Canon 6, of Title III., relating to the organization of new Dioceses. The resolution is:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 2, of Canon 6, of Title III., be amended, so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. In case there should be no Bishop who can call such Primary Convention, pursuant to the foregoing provision, then the duty of calling such Convention for the purpose of organizing, and the duty of fixing the time and place of its meeting, shall be vested in the Standing Committee of the Diocese within the limits of which the new one is erected, or of the Standing Committee of the eldest of the Dioceses by the junction of which or parts of which the new Diocese may be formed; and such Standing Committee shall make such call immediately after the ratification of a division by the General Convention."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The Convention will perceive that the only change suggested here is the introduction of a clause whereby the Standing Committee of a divided Diocese can call a Primary Convention. The case supposed is that of a Diocese divided, and the Bishop dying subsequent to the division. In the Canon as it stands there is provision in that case for the calling of the Primary Convention by the Standing Committee of the eldest of two or more Dioceses by the union of parts of which the new Diocese is formed, but there is no provision for the calling of a Primary Convention where the Diocese is divided. This simply makes provision for that case.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 12) from the House of Bishops announced the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That Subsection 4, of Section 7, of Canon 12, of Title I. of the Digest be amended by inserting after the words 'General Theological Seminary' these words, viz.: 'professors and tutors in any university or college which is maintained and governed by two or more Dioceses associated for that purpose.'"

On motion of Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, the message was referred to the Committee on Canons.

A message (No. 13) from the House of Bishops announced the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That Section 1, of Canon 4, of Title I. be amended by inserting after the word 'Diocese' the words 'and Missionary District.'"

On motion of Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, the message was referred to the Committee on Canons.

A message (No. 14) from the House of Bishops announced the appointment by that House of the Bishops of Nebraska, Central New York, and New Hampshire as members on its part of the Joint Committee to nominate a Board of Missions.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT.

The PRESIDENT. I would here call attention to a point of order that was before us a short time ago, but not for the purpose of deciding it arbitrarily, as it is not before us, but that I may be advised hereafter the views of those having experience in such matters. I perceive that Mr. Cushing, in his Manual, says that "motions to commit or recommit may be amended by instructions to the committee."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Does he say that that is the case where the motion to recommit must

be decided without debate? A motion to recommit under Cushing's Manual is debatable, but under our rules it is not debatable, and therefore it strikes me that our rule overrides the usual parliamentary rule.

The PRESIDENT. That is a question for the House to consider. I had a very distinct remembrance that a proposition to instruct a committee changed the character of the motion to recommit.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. Is it in order now to give notice of a motion to be made to-morrow in regard to the appointment of a Committee on the Rules of the House?

The PRESIDENT. I suppose the House will by general consent at this late hour agree to receive almost any business which is proposed.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. We spend a great deal of time in this body in discussing the rules of the House. I give notice that to-morrow I shall move to amend the rules so as to provide for the appointment by the Chair of a Standing Committee on the Rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF COMMUNICANTS.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar will be reported.

The Secretary read the following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 12, of Title II., so as to require a certificate to be produced by every communicant upon his removal from one parish to another, and forbidding any rector to receive a communicant without such letter or certificate:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 12, of Title II., of the Digest."

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the resolution be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

EXPENSES OF PRESIDING BISHOP.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next business on the Calendar.

The Secretary read the Resolutions reported by the Committee on Expenses, the first being:

"Resolved, That the Treasurer of this Convention be instructed to reserve \$500, subject to the call of the Presiding Bishop, for the payment of such expenses as may be incurred by him in the discharge of the duties incident to his office during the next three years."

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

SALARY OF SECRETARIES.

The Secretary read the next resolution of the Committee on Expenses, viz.:

"Resolved, That the Treasurer be instructed to pay to the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies the sum of \$750, and to the Secretary of the House of Bishops \$250."

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I do not think that for the duties of the Secretary of this House \$750 are enough, and I move to amend the resolution by making it \$1,000. The Secretary of the House of Bishops has nothing to do with the publication of the Journal or its distribution, while the Secretary of this House has an immense amount of work to do. I am free to say, from my own personal knowledge, as having been Secretary of this House in the years 1841, 1844, and 1847, that as the Church has increased it is impossible for the Secretary to perform his duties and meet his expenses for

a less sum than \$1,000. I therefore move to insert \$1,000 instead of \$750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

ASSESSMENT ON THE DIOCESES.

The Secretary read the next resolution of the Committee on Expenses, as follows:

"Resolved, That in case the assessment of \$3 for each clergyman, as provided by Canon for the payment of the incidental expenses of the Convention, should be found insufficient for that purpose, the Secretary of this House and the Treasurer jointly are hereby authorized and directed to make such additional assessments on the Dioceses respectively, and the Treasurer to collect the same, as may be found necessary for the payment of such expenses."

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Mass. I would like to ask whether that has been our usual custom or not. If it has been, I have nothing to say against it; but it seems loose for us to leave a matter so much at odds and ends.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that it has been the usual custom.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. It is necessary.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. I will explain that it is impossible now to say exactly what our expenses will be. The Canon provides for an assessment of \$3; but it is always found necessary, at least it has been for some time, to provide a little more liberally than that; but exactly how much we cannot tell. The Committee had this under consideration, and on considering the matter thought that this was the best way that we could settle the question.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THANKS TO TRINITY CHURCH.

The Secretary read the next resolution of the Committee on Expenses, as follows:

"Resolved, That we gratefully recognize the liberality of Trinity Church in its provision for the welfare, comfort, and convenience of the members of this Convention, whereby facilities for doing our work have been so amply provided and our expenses so materially reduced."

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. This resolution we shall all be ready to vote for, but it will come certainly much better towards the close, inasmuch as we are thanking when we have only half received that we are thanking for.

The SECRETARY. I will state to the House that this has reference to the very liberal provision made in behalf of the House of stationery and every possible convenience in the way of conducting our business.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Still, we can receive some more. I have not the slightest objection to thank them now, if you will allow a motion to thank them afterwards. [Laughter.]

The SECRETARY. We will do that.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADOPTION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar will now be reported by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution reported that the change in the fifth article of the Constitution was not adopted, and the resolution which is now before us is Mr. Burgwin's resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I move that that resolution be made the order of the day for Thursday, at two o'clock. My reason is that there is another matter pertaining to the same thing now before the same Committee, which before that time will be reported upon. I desire, as a member of that Committee, and as one interested in this matter, that this resolution lie over until next Thursday, and be then made the order of the day for two o'clock, so that both reports may come before the House at the same time, as they both pertain to the same subject; and I may desire to be heard upon them.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. My motion was made, as members will remember, simply for the purpose of bringing what is a very important matter before the House, and that is whether, when this House have passed a Canon or adopted an amendment to the Constitution, and sent it to the House of Bishops, and that House adjourn before the three days have expired within which they may return it with their objections or amend it, such a Canon has the force of law by virtue of the expiration of the term for which the Bishops are in session. I do not propose to discuss the question now. I simply say that, when the Committee made their report and decided that such a Canon or such a proposed amendment fell, I was unwilling that this House should concur in that view without an opportunity of having the matter considered before the House. I therefore concur most heartily in the motion of the gentleman from Texas to fix a time when the matter may come up, and this House can then decide as to whether they will agree with the views of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution or not.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. The question at issue is this: There has been proposed a constitutional amendment allowing Dioceses of vast proportions, too large for the supervision of one Bishop, to set off a part of their territory into missionary jurisdictions, with the consent of this Convention. That amendment was proposed by this House three years ago. It went to the House of Bishops. They took no action upon it, by mere accident. Our Secretary sent out the proposition to the several Dioceses. There has been no return from them of any dissent; and now, when it is asked that this Convention ratify that constitutional amendment, the question is referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution; and that Committee report to this House that the initiatory steps were never completed. The gentleman from Pittsburgh desires, as well as myself, that further information in regard to this matter should be laid before this House, and further consideration be had. For this reason, I have moved that it be made the subject of our consideration on Thursday next at two o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to postpone the consideration of the resolution to Thursday, at two o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The report of the Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the subject of so amending Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, so as to provide that the testimonials of Bishops-elect shall be sent to the several Diocesan Standing Committees and the several Bishops, in all cases, instead of, as now, to the General Convention when within six months of the meeting of that body, reported for adoption the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be

discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, of the Digest.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I move to make that subject the special order for Friday at two o'clock.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Is there any reason why those reports should take precedence of other business? Why should they not go regularly on the Calendar as other reports?

The PRESIDENT. They are on the Calendar now, and we are acting upon them. The question is on the motion to make this subject the special order for Friday at two o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I think my point is well taken, on further reflection. The point is not whether it has been on the Calendar or not; but why can it not stay on the Calendar, and come up when we regularly reach it again?

The PRESIDENT. That is in the discretion of the House.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. If we are to charge every hour on Thursday and every hour on Friday, as we are beginning to do, with special orders of the day, it will entirely interfere with the regular business of the House.

The PRESIDENT. The question has been taken on making this subject a special order. If the same motion is made in regard to the next business, your argument will be in order.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was made the special order for Friday.

The PRESIDENT. Did you vote in the majority?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I voted, inadvertently, in the majority, but I now see no reason why we should postpone the subject until Friday, when we have ten or fifteen minutes to act upon it to-day.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I beg to oppose the motion to reconsider. Many of the reports on the Calendar have been acted upon; but upon those reports as to which there are differences of opinion, I think an opportunity should be given to bring those differences of opinion to the notice of the House, that we may act intelligently.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Those gentlemen are charged with that information now as well as they will be on Friday. When gentlemen bring measures before us for adoption, we expect that they have considered them maturely, so that a postponement of one day or two days is not a matter of consequence, and it is fatal to the regular deliberations of this body to have these continual special orders made unless there is some good reason for it.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. If there is any question proper to be set apart for a particular time, this is one of those questions, and I hope the House will not reconsider the decision it has made.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It was not my intention to shorten debate, but to go on with the matter now, and if we did not get through by four o'clock, to let it come up again to-morrow. But as this discussion is consuming so much time, I withdraw the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT. There is nothing more on the Calendar, I am told by the Secretary.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Mr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I offer the following as an additional section to Canon 4 of Title II, "Of the Dissolution of Pastoral Connection," to be referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Whenever any minister of this Church shall absent himself from his parish for a period of time

exceeding three months, without the consent or approbation of the vestry thereof, the vestry may declare the parish vacant, and it shall so be."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

SENTENCES OF SUSPENSION.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. I offer the following:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to enquire and report whether the disjunctive 'or,' before the words 'at what time,' in Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II., should not be changed to the conjunctive 'and,' so as to read as follows:

"Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms and at what time said penalty shall cease."

Evidently it was a mistake inadvertently. I therefore move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

LAY READERS.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I offer the following:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to consider and report whether the following subsection should not be added in the printed copy of the Digest as Section 2, Canon 9, Title I.

"The Bishop may at his discretion set apart a lay reader at some public service in the Convocation by special prayer and benediction, without laying on of hands."

I am informed that that section passed at the last Convention, but through some inadvertence was not printed as having been passed. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Canons to enquire whether it ought to be in the printed Canons.

The PRESIDENT. My information about it is that it was passed by this House, but was not passed by the House of Bishops.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I have been informed that it passed by the omission of the House of Bishops to act upon it within three days while they were in session. This is simply a resolution of enquiry whether the fact be that it has passed or has not.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. It can do no harm to pass the resolution.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The hour of four having arrived, the Convention stands adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

—♦♦—

SEVENTH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, October 14.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel, at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. Robert C. McIlwain, of Iowa. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Edmund T. Perkins, D.D., of Kentucky, who also said the Litany. The Benediction was pronounced by the Rt. Rev. Henry Champlin Lay, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Easton.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported a resolution granting

the request of Mr. William P. Wheeler, of Ohio, for leave of absence during the remainder of the session.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I move to add, "and that all future applications of that kind be referred to that Committee, with power to act."

The PRESIDENT. Had not that better be a separate resolution?

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. Perhaps the amendment can be acted on at once.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair then will put the question. The amendment is that all applications for leave of absence during the remainder of the session be referred to the Committee on Elections, with power to act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, also reported that evidence had been presented of the appointment of Mr. Tazewell Taylor as supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of Virginia, in place of Mr. R. C. L. Moncure, and of the appointment of the Rev. William Munford, of Florida, a supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of Florida, in place of the Rev. R. H. Weller, and that these names had been entered by the Secretary on the roll.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. I am requested also by the Committee to report on another matter, which I shall have to do somewhat informally. The Rev. J. H. Hopkins, Jr., has presented to the Committee satisfactory evidence of his election as a supplementary Deputy by the Diocese of Albany, and of his designation by the Bishop of Albany to the place of the Rev. William Payne, D.D., of the same Diocese. The Committee, however, having had the matter under consideration, are clearly of the opinion that, as the Rev. Dr. Payne is absent by leave of the House, and for a few days only, no vacancy exists in the representation of the Diocese of Albany, and that, therefore, no supplementary Deputy ought to be admitted. I make this report as part of the action of the Committee, and at the urgent request of the supplementary Deputy whose certificate has been referred to, proposing no action for the House, but leaving the House to originate such action as in its judgment it may deem proper.

SYNOD OF ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on the Prayer-Book, to whom was referred the memorial of the Rev. John H. Anketell and others, asking this House to take such measures as in their wisdom may seem proper toward the assembling at as early a day as possible of a Synod of all the Bishops in communion with the See of Canterbury, for the consideration of all questions relating to the English Version of the Holy Scriptures and the Creeds, and the relations of the Anglican Church to other Christian bodies, beg leave to propose for adoption the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient in this body to take any action on the subject."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Cannot the resolution be acted upon now?

The PRESIDENT. If the House is ready for the question it can be acted on at once. The Chair hears no objection to present action.

The resolution was adopted.

RELATIONS WITH CANADIAN CHURCH.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it will be remembered that a Joint Commit-

tee was appointed by the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies to meet the Delegation from the Provincial Synod of Canada in regard to such measures as that Delegation desired to bring before this General Convention. The Committee met, and in order to explain what follows I will read the first resolution which was passed :

"Resolved, That three copies of the proceedings of this Joint Committee be prepared by the Most Rev. the Lord Bishop of Montreal, the Chairman, and Secretary, and placed in the hands of the Delegation of the Provincial Synod of Canada, of the House of Bishops and of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies respectively, to be presented to their constituent bodies."

Then follow written resolutions, which were passed by this Joint Committee, and perhaps it will be necessary to read them in order that the House may dispose of them as it may think best:

"At a meeting of the Joint Committee of the House of Bishops and of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies appointed for the purpose, with the Delegation from the Provincial Synod of Canada; there being present of the latter,

The Most Rev. the LORD BISHOP of Montreal, Metropolitan.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP of Quebec.

The Rev. Dean GEDDES, Rector of Hamilton and Prolocutor.

The Venerable Archdeacon BALCH.

The Rev. Canon ELLIGOOD.

The Rev. Canon KETCHUM, and

The Rev. H. ROE, Professor of Divinity, Lennoxville University.

And of the former,

The Right Rev. the BISHOP of Long Island.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP of Ohio.

The Rev. WILLIAM RUDDER, D.D.

The Rev. ALEXANDER H. VINTON, D.D.

The Rev. ISRAEL FOOTE, D.D.

The Hon. HAMILTON FISH.

The Hon. SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, and

Mr. ORLANDO MEADS.

"The Most Rev. the Lord Bishop of Montreal being in the Chair, the following resolutions were unanimously passed, on the motion of the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Quebec, seconded by the Rev. Canon Ketchum :

"It was resolved,

"That it be recommended that it be made by the Provincial Synod of Canada the duty of all Bishops in the Canadian Church to require testimonials and letters dismissory from the Bishop of the Diocese in which a clergyman has last served, before granting such clergyman a license, if it be found the case is not already provided for.

"On motion of the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Long Island, seconded by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Quebec, it was

"Resolved, That clergymen having charge of parishes and missions be requested to furnish families and individuals in their respective cures, who are about to emigrate to the United States or to Canada, such letters of commendation, and other information touching their character and wants, as will secure to them, upon their arrival, fraternal welcome and pastoral sympathy and care in the common fold in which they have been nurtured; and that, when practicable, duplicate letters be sent to the clergymen under whose parochial charge the person or persons immigrating may come.

"On motion of the Venerable Archdeacon Balch, seconded by the Rev. Dr. Rudder, it was

"Resolved, That on the suspension or deposition of any clergyman from the ministry, by a Bishop of either Church, notice of the same shall be given by the Bishop suspending or deposing said clergy-

man to all the other Bishops of the Church in the United States and in British North America.

"On motion of the Rev. Dr. Vinton, seconded by the venerable Archdeacon Balch, it was

"Resolved, That, until some organ for collecting and diffusing necessary information be established by the Church in Canada, it be recommended to the Board of Missions to take order that a department of *The Spirit of Missions* be devoted to the use of the Canadian Church, under an editor to be appointed by that Church, in order that each Church may know what the other is doing to preach the Gospel to all men.

"On motion of the Rev. Dean Geddes, seconded by the Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles, it was

"Resolved, That it is desirable that this Joint Committee should continue in existence, and hold its sessions and prosecute its work during the next three years, by correspondence or otherwise, in order that such measures as have been suggested may be further matured and reported to the General Convention and the Provincial Synod of 1877.

"On motion of the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Ohio, seconded by the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Long Island, it was

"Resolved, That three copies of the proceedings of this Joint Committee be prepared and certified by the Most Rev. the Lord Bishop of Montreal, the Chairman, and the Secretary, and placed in the hands of the Delegation from the Provincial Synod of Canada, the House of Bishops, and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies respectively, to be presented to their constituent bodies.

"On motion of the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Long Island, seconded by the Hon. Hamilton Fish, it was

"Resolved, That, as it has been found impracticable to complete the business assigned to it, the Joint Committee ask to be continued until the next General Convention.

(Signed) "A. MONTREAL, Chairman.

WILLIAM RUDDER, Secretary."

I read these, and ask the House to dispose of them as they may think best. It is suggested that it would be well to have the report printed. If that be the sense of the House, I move that five hundred copies be printed for the use of the House.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to print five hundred copies of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. I think it proper at this period, in connection with the report which has just been read, to read a paper addressed to the President of the House :

"NEW YORK, October 13, 1874.

"At a meeting of the Delegation from the Provincial Synod of Canada to the General Convention of the Church in the United States, the Lord Bishop of Quebec in the Chair, it was, on motion of the Reverend Dean Geddes, Prolocutor, seconded by the Venerable Archdeacon Balch—

"Resolved, That the delegation from the Provincial Synod cannot return home without expressing their grateful appreciation of the cordial and affectionate manner in which they have been received by the General Convention, and of the hospitality extended to them by citizens of New York and Brooklyn, and this Delegation feel assured that it will afford great pleasure to the Provincial Synod and to the Canadian Church should a delegation from this General Convention be appointed to attend the next triennial meeting of the Provincial Synod, which meets in September, 1877.

"J. W. QUEBEC, Chairman.

"LEWIS P. W. BALCH, Secretary."

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I suggest that that be placed on the Calendar, and taken up with the previous report when printed.

The PRESIDENT. It is proposed that the paper go on the Calendar, and be taken up in connection with the report just ordered to be printed. That course will be pursued.

ORDER OF DEACONESSSES.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts, submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee appointed at the last General Convention to consider the expediency of reviving the primitive order of Deaconesses, after giving the subject careful consideration, unanimously recommend the passage of the following Canon:

"Of Deaconesses or Sisters.

"Sec. 1. Women of devout character and approved fitness may be set apart by any Bishop of this Church for the work of a Deaconess or Sister, according to such form as shall be authorized by the Bishop of any Diocese.

"Sec. 2. The duties proper to a Deaconess or Sister are declared to be the care of our Lord's poor and sick, the education of the young, the religious instruction of the neglected, and the work of moral reformation.

"Sec. 3. No woman shall be set apart for the work of a Deaconess or Sister until she shall be twenty-five years of age, unless the Bishop for special reasons shall deem it expedient to admit candidates at an earlier age, the age of admission in no case to be less than twenty-one years; it being further provided that no woman shall be so set apart until she shall have laid before the Bishop testimonials certifying (a) that she is a communicant in good standing in this Church; (b) that she possesses such characteristics as, in the judgment of the persons testifying, fit her for at least one of the branches of duty above defined. Such testimonials shall be signed by one Presbyter of this Church, and by five lay communicants of the same, of whom two shall be men and three women. The Bishop shall also satisfy himself that the applicant has had an adequate preparation for her work, both technical and religious, which preparation shall have covered the period of at least one year.

"Sec. 4. No Deaconess or Sister shall work officially in a Diocese without the express authority in writing of the Bishop of that Diocese.

"Sec. 5. A Deaconess or Sister may at any time resign her office to the ecclesiastical authority from which she received it; but no Deaconess or Sister, having once given up her commission, shall be reappointed, unless, in the judgment of the Bishop, such resignation was for weighty cause.

"Sec. 6. A Deaconess or Sister may be transferred from one Diocese to another by letters dimissory, upon request of the Bishop of the Diocese to which she is transferred.

"Sec. 7. The Constitution and Rules for the home government of any community of Deaconesses shall have the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese in which such community exists; and all books of devotion and formularies of worship used in such community shall have the like sanction, and shall be in harmony with the usages of this Church and the principles of the Book of Common Prayer.

HORATIO POTTER, Bishop of New York.

RICHARD H. WILMER, Bishop of Alabama.

A. N. LITTLEJOHN, Bishop of Long Island.

JOHN FRANKLIN SPAULDING, Bishop of Colorado.

WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON, Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts.

WILLIAM WELSH, Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania.

SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, Lay Deputy from New York."

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I should say that this report has the signatures of all the members of the Committee who are present in the Convention, and it has the assent of the only absent member who is a member of the Convention, one member of the Committee having ceased to be such by failing of re-election to the Triennial Convention. In other words, it is a strictly unanimous report. I move its reference to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I rise to second the motion, and if a moment of explanation is allowed, I would merely ask the various members of the House at their leisure to visit the Sisters' institutions in this city and the Deaconesses' institution in Long Island. I think if we visit those institutions and see their work we shall be enabled to vote intelligently on this Canon when it comes up.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the report of this special committee be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina. May I request the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania to state where those institutions of Sisters are to be found? I should be glad to know.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. There are two in New York. The Bishop of New York will make the way easy. There is one in Long Island. The Bishop of Long Island will give every one facilities for reaching it. I will, however, have the specific directions where the houses are laid upon the desk of the Secretary, so that any member who desires to visit them may have the information asked for.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The following invitation was handed to me, with the request that I would read it. It is addressed to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, now sitting in St. John's Chapel, New York City:

"The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals hereby tenders to the Convention a cordial invitation to visit the Headquarters, corner of Fourth Avenue and East Twenty-second Street. The Society believes that an examination of its work and objects will induce the members of the Convention to aid its humane mission by personal advocacy among their parishioners and friends of its unceasing pleas for mercy to the dumb creation.

"With profound respect,
"HENRY BERGH, President."

A word or two. These points have been handed to me, which, I think, will increase the interest in the institution:

1. This Society has now twenty-seven branches in as many States and Territories, all having the like laws and common seal and badge.

2. It bears the approval of the living and the dead—the latter by large legacies to it, showing that its work is not limited to time.

3. Its work is limited to no country or nation. There are to-day two branch societies in Calcutta and Bombay. And on the left bank of the river Ganges stands a column of red granite bearing an inscription, recently translated, found to be over two thousand years old, and a law against cruelty to animals.

4. It has the approbation of the English Church. Very lately the Lord Bishop of Manchester, in Westminster Abbey, preached a sermon before the English Society, and the Queen and ablest men in the Church are all members of it.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut, presented a memorial of the Diocesan Convention of Con-

necticut, asking the General Convention to take measures toward securing for use in Divine worship an English version of the Creed commonly called the Nicene Creed, as conformable as may be to the original text; which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

Rev. Mr. RICHARDSON, of Texas, presented a memorial of the Diocesan Convention of Texas on the Hymnal, which was referred to the Joint Committee on the Hymnal.

Rev. Mr. RICHARDSON, of Texas, presented a memorial of the Diocesan Convention of Texas, on the subject of establishing a court of appeal; which was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Mr. PERKINS, of Kentucky, presented a memorial of the Diocesan Convention of Kentucky, on the subject of Ritual Uniformity; which was referred to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. CROSDALE, of Easton, presented a memorial of the Diocesan Convention of Easton, touching a version of the Nicene Creed; which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

FAREWELL OF CANADIAN METROPOLITAN.

The PRESIDENT. The Most Rev. the Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada is present, and desires to take leave of the House.

The members rose.

The BISHOP OF MONTREAL. Mr. President and gentlemen of this House, before I quit this city, which I propose to do this evening, and before these doors are closed against visitors (which will be in a few minutes, I understand), I am anxious to say a very few words to you, to express, from my very heart, the gratitude I feel for the kindness which you have shown us. I leave this city and this Convention with feelings, I can assure you, of great admiration, and great or greater gratitude—of admiration when I have looked upon this vast and important and august assembly, an assembly to which I was going to apply the epithet of orderly, and which is an orderly assembly considering its vast numbers; and I would offer a very humble—I was going to say “hint”—but I would rather say a thought which has come across me from attending the deliberations in this Church. That thought is, and that wish in my own heart is, that if I ever in God’s providence am spared to attend another Convention in New York, I do hope and trust it may be in some great building erected specially for the purpose and specially worthy of this noble assembly.

I leave the city also with admiration at the vast meeting which I attended last night, certainly the grandest and most noble religious meeting I ever attended in my life, a meeting which testifies to the great hold which your Church and its work has upon the affections of the mass, when I think of the great numbers which were gathered in that theatre last night.

I also leave this city with feelings of great gratitude to you for the kind manner in which you have received me and those brethren who have accompanied me, and who are, like myself, strangers among you. We feel your kindness, and we desire long to feel it, and I am sure we shall not easily forget it. I only wish that there could be some way in which we could reciprocate it.

I thank you, too, for the specially kind manner in which you have received my dear brother, the Bishop of Lichfield, not only, I am sure, from the intrinsic merits and loveliness of his Christian character, but also because he comes among you as a sort of representative of our own Mother Church, and to many of us our common mother country. The Church of England is strong; the Church in the United States is strong, I feel sure from what I have seen; the Church also in Canada

is strong; but ‘oh! how much stronger each and all of us would be, how much more imposing a front should we present to our foes, how much more gloriously should we carry on God’s great work committed to us, if we become even more closely drawn together than we are at present; and I do hope and trust that the result of this meeting of the Convention will be a larger feeling, a closer drawing together of those blessed bonds which unite us in Christ and unite us as members of the same body.

I now thank you for having listened to the few plain words which I have uttered. I thank you on my behalf and on behalf of my brethren who are with me, and I desire from my heart to pray that God’s blessing may rest upon you and upon that Church which you represent.

The Bishop retired, and the members resumed their seats.

THE SECRET SESSION.

Rev. Dr. LOCKE, of Illinois. I offer the following resolution:

“Resolved, That when this House goes into secret session at twelve o’clock meridian, any visiting clergy or laymen from the Dioceses of Wisconsin or Illinois shall be allowed to be present, if they so desire.”

It seems to me that explains itself. Members of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Illinois are here, and would like to be present.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. Is the consideration of that resolution now in order, the Chair having just called for the order of the day—resolutions and motions?

The PRESIDENT. This is a resolution.

Rev. Dr. LOCKE, of Illinois. It is a privileged question.

The PRESIDENT. I do not know about it being a privileged question; but it is a resolution and can be offered. If objected to, of course it goes on the Calendar.

Mr. CHURCHILL, of Kentucky. I object to it.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. It is a matter of privilege and of courtesy. As we are about to go into secret session on the order of the day, I take it we are quite competent to entertain such a resolution, as it bears especially on the matter which is to be brought to our notice at this time. I do not wish to enter into any extended advocacy of it. If it does not commend itself to members of this Convention on its own account, surely no labored argument could convince any one who hesitates for a moment. It seems to me simply natural and proper that those who are most deeply interested in the subject which we have now for our consideration should be allowed by courtesy to be present at our deliberations, having no vote or voice—simply as a matter of courtesy, not as a matter of right.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I ask whether any resolution of this kind does not require a day’s notice?

The PRESIDENT. I was just looking at the rules to get the answer to that question and to some others raised in regard to this resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The Chair will find that the twenty-eighth rule renders this resolution out of order: “No amendment of these rules shall be made unless one day’s notice shall have been given of the motion to amend.” This resolution changes the rule, and requires a day’s notice.

The PRESIDENT. That is the decision of the Chair.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I venture to say that this does not come within the category of ordinary resolutions.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. It changes a rule.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. It is simply and solely a question of privilege, and therefore I contend that it is proper for our consideration before we proceed to the matter which is the order of the day.

Mr. FISH, of New York. Mr. President, I submit that this resolution is entirely out of order. It is practically a motion to reconsider the order of this House to sit with closed doors. That order was passed some two or three days since, and the time within which a motion to reconsider can be made has expired. I therefore hold, and submit to the Chair, that the resolution is out of order.

The PRESIDENT. I think it is.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that we proceed to consider the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. No motion is necessary for that purpose.

Rev. Mr. BARBER, of Easton. I wish to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDENT. It is too late, because the order of the day is called for. This is the hour fixed for the consideration of the reports of the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops, which, by a rule of the House, are to be considered with closed doors. Persons not Deputies will retire from the House.

The House was cleared and remained in secret session till the hour of adjournment, when it adjourned till to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M., when it meets with closed doors to resume the business under consideration to-day.

EIGHTH DAY.

THURSDAY, October 15.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel, at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. W. T. Dickinson Dalzell, D.D., of Louisiana. The Lessons were read by Rev. Christopher S. Lefingwell, of Maine. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Montgomery Schuyler, D.D., of Missouri. The Benediction was pronounced by the Rt. Rev. Henry Adams Neely, D.D., Bishop of Maine.

The PRESIDENT. It was determined yesterday, by the last vote taken before the adjournment, that we should sit with closed doors to-day in continuation of the matter then before us. I suppose that the spirit, and even the letter, of that order requires that the House be cleared now.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Do I understand the Chair that we are to sit with closed doors?

The PRESIDENT. That is my understanding of the resolution passed last evening. If it is objected to, I will wait to hear objections before giving the order for closing the doors.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. It was a positive enactment, was it not, that we were to sit with closed doors?

The PRESIDENT. Certainly; there is no question about that. The doors were to be closed immediately after Divine service.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I understand the Lay Deputy from New York asks the privilege of making some explanation before the House is closed.

The PRESIDENT. Very well; let him do it.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Mr. President, I was informed five minutes ago, for the first time, to my inexpressible astonishment, that an article appeared in one of the morning papers saying that I had communicated to a reporter at four o'clock yes-

terday the fact that the House had accepted the nomination of Dr. Welles. I pronounce the whole statement as absolutely false in every possible respect. I never uttered the one-hundred-thousandth part of a syllable relative to any action in our secret session. It is an absolute and unqualified misstatement.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I was asked yesterday to procure for the House the names and residences of the various Deaconess institutions and Sisterhoods in New York and Brooklyn. I have procured them, and will leave them on the Secretary's table, so that copies may be had by any member of the House.

The PRESIDENT. Those who are not members of the House will retire, and the doors will be closed.

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. Mr. President, it is to a question of privilege that I rise, similar, to a certain extent, to that brought before the House by the Hon. Mr. Ruggles, of this city, to correct a statement made in the public papers.

My attention has been called this morning to certain statements in the public papers of this city, in which very large and liberal use has been made of my name, and use made of it in connections which are calculated to prejudice me very largely with this House. It had occurred to me that the most proper course for me would be, with reference to these statements in the public papers, to write a card of explanation to the papers, and I think that even yet it will be the wisest course for me to follow, because these statements are scattered through all the different papers, four or five, in this city, that I have been able to lay hold of. I am not prepared to say by whom these statements have been made. They have been made by persons, either clergymen or laymen, to the reporters of those papers, and by them embodied in their columns. I think it would occupy too much of the time of this House at the present moment to enter fully into these explanations; and, perhaps, it would be wisest and best for me to reserve them for a letter of explanation, which will be visible to all.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to suggest to the gentleman that reporters are here and others, and we agreed that after Divine service we should close our doors. I think we ought not to have anything of this kind.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Illinois has finished his explanation, I believe.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. We ought to have our doors closed.

The PRESIDENT. While the doors are being closed, there are messages from the House of Bishops, which will be laid before the House.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 15) was received from the House of Bishops announcing the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the action of the House of Deputies increasing the number of the Joint Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book, and, reappointing as members of said Committee, on the part of this House, the Bishops of Rhode Island and Vermont, adds to the Committee the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania."

A message (No. 16) was received from the House of Bishops announcing the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That Canon 13 of Title I, be amended by changing the words "missionary jurisdiction," wherever they occur, into the words "missionary district."

A message (No. 17) was received from the House

of Bishops, announcing the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That Section 1, of Canon 2, of Title I., be amended by substituting in place of the words 'Any five Bishops of this Church,' the words 'The five senior Bishops of this Church,' and that the said section be further amended by adding these following words: 'Provided, That if the Bishop applying be one of the five, the Bishop next in seniority shall be counted in his place.'"

Messages No. 16 and 17 were referred to the Committee on Canons.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The President appointed Mr. Edmund H. Bennett, of Massachusetts, upon the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, in place of Mr. R. C. L. Moncure, of Virginia, resigned.

THE SECRET SESSION.

The church having been cleared, the House proceeded with closed doors to consider the business which was yesterday before the body in secret session, and so continued beyond the usual hour of adjournment.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW DIOCESES.

During the session, a message (No. 18) was received from the House of Bishops announcing its concurrence in the amendment proposed by the House of Deputies to Section 2, of Canon 6, Title III., communicated in Message No. 10 of the House of Deputies, being relative to the calling of the Primary Convention in a new Diocese formed by the division of an existing Diocese.

COMMITTEES ON CANONS.

A message (No. 19) from the House of Bishops announced the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Committees on Canons of the two Houses have power to sit as a Joint Committee whenever either House shall communicate to the other a request to that effect."

On motion of Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, the resolution was concurred in.

At half-past four o'clock P.M., the House adjourned till to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M.

NINTH DAY.

FRIDAY, October 16.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at 10 A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Meyer Lewin, D.D., of Maryland, and concluded by Rev. Samuel M. Haskins, D.D., of Long Island. The Litany was said by Rev. Alexander Burgess, D.D., of Massachusetts. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. Thomas Atkinson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT. The House will come to order. Rev. Dr. RUNCIE, of Missouri. May I have the privilege of presenting a memorial?

The PRESIDENT. I suppose if you choose to present it amid the confusion of clearing the House there can be no reason why you should not.

Rev. Dr. RUNCIE, of Missouri. It is a memorial in regard to the admission of members from the Missionary Jurisdictions.

The PRESIDENT. It may be presented.

Rev. Dr. RUNCIE, of Missouri. I wish to have it read, if such be the pleasure of the House.

The PRESIDENT. It cannot be read without a vote of the House. Under an order of the House,

we meet with closed doors to-day. All persons not members of the House are requested to retire.

The Church having been cleared, the House with closed doors resumed the consideration of the business yesterday under discussion.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

During the secret session, the following messages were received from the House of Bishops:

A message (No. 20) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee to confer with the Joint Committee of the Provincial Synod of Canada be continued until the next General Convention.

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That a deputation, consisting of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three Laymen, be appointed to attend the next Provincial Synod of Canada, with a view to the promotion of the joint interests of the two Churches."

The resolutions were concurred in.

A message (No. 21) was received from the House of Bishops, announcing the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the following Canon of Divorce be substituted in place of Canon 13, of Title III., which is hereby repealed; and that the said Canon be numbered Canon 13, of Title II., viz.:

"Canon of Divorce.

"Sec. 1. If any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful.

"Sec. 2. No minister of this Church shall solemnize matrimony in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, and where the divorce was obtained for some cause arising after marriage; but this Canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again.

"Sec. 3. No minister of this Church shall present for confirmation or administer the Holy Sacrament to any person divorced for any cause arising after marriage, and married to another in violation of this Canon, during the lifetime of such divorced wife or husband; but this prohibition shall not extend to the innocent party where the divorce has been for the cause of adultery, nor to any penitent person *in extremis*.

"Sec. 4. Questions touching the facts of any case arising under this Canon shall be referred to the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary District, or, if there be a vacancy in the Episcopate, then to some Bishop designated by the Standing Committee, who shall thereupon make enquiry, by a Commissary or otherwise, and deliver his godly judgment in the premises.

"Sec. 5. This Canon, so far as it affixes penalties, does not apply to cases occurring before its taking effect, according to Canon 4, Title IV."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

The following reports were received during the secret session, and ordered to be placed on the Calendar:

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the following resolution, to wit:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to report a Canon or Rule of Order for the proper organization of the House of Deputies, at the commencement of each regular session thereof, and

that the Committee consider and report upon the election of one or more Vice-Presidents, to preside in the absence of the President from the chair"—beg leave to report:

"On the first page of the volume containing the Journal of the General Convention of 1871 will be found a permanent *Order* of this House prescribing the duties of the Secretary, and incidentally giving directions as to the manner of organizing the House. The Committee recommend the enlargement of this *Order*, and a change in the Title, as follows, to wit:

"*First*. In the Title, strike out all after the word '*Order*,' and insert '*of the Organization of the House of Deputies, and prescribing the Duties of the Secretary.*'

"*Second*. Strike out the first paragraph of Section 1, and insert:

"Sec. 1. At the time and place appointed for the meeting of the General Convention, the Secretary, or in his absence the Assistant Secretary, or, in the absence of both, the person appointed as hereinafter provided by the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the General Convention is to meet, shall call to order the members present of the House of Deputies, and record the names of those whose testimonials in due form shall have been presented to him; which record shall be *prima facie* evidence that the persons whose names are therein recorded are entitled to seats in the House of Deputies. If there be a quorum present, by the record, the Secretary shall so declare, and the House shall proceed to organize by the election by ballot of a President from the members of the House, and of a Secretary; and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. So soon as a President and Secretary have been elected, the House shall at once proceed to the election of a Vice-President, by ballot, and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. The Vice-President on being elected may take his seat by the President, to aid him in the discharge of his duties; and he shall preside in the absence of the President from the chair. But the President shall appoint all committees, unless the House shall otherwise order. Before proceeding to other business, a committee shall be appointed to wait upon the House of Bishops, and inform them of the organization of the House of Deputies, and its readiness to proceed to business.

"*Third*. After the word '*Secretary*,' in the seventh line of the second paragraph of Section 1, insert '*and the Secretary and Assistant Secretary shall continue in office until the organization of the next Convention, and until their successors be chosen.*'

"*Fourth*. Add to Section 2: '*He shall also forward a duplicate copy of such testimonials to the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the next General Convention is to meet.*'

"The Committee further recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this order, so far as applies to the election of a Vice-President, be effectual from the date of this resolution; and that the House proceed forthwith to the election of a Vice-President."

"By order of the Committee,

"WM. COOPER MEAD, Chairman.

"October 16, 1874."

Order (as proposed to be amended) of the Organization of the House of Deputies, and prescribing the Duties of the Secretary. (Adopted October 15, 1841; amended October 2, 1844, October 9, 1874, and October —, 1874.)

Section 1. At the time and place appointed for the meeting of the General Convention, the Secretary, or, in his absence, the Assistant Secretary, or, in the absence of both, the person appointed as hereinafter provided by the Standing Committee of the

Diocese in which the General Convention is to meet, shall call to order the members present of the House of Deputies, and record the names of those whose testimonials in due form shall have been presented to him, which record shall be *prima facie* evidence that the persons whose names are therein recorded are entitled to seats in the House of Deputies. If there be a quorum present, by the record the Secretary shall so declare, and the House shall proceed to organize by the election by ballot of a President from the members of the House, and of a Secretary; and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. So soon as the President and Secretary have been elected the House shall at once proceed to the election of a Vice-President, by ballot; and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. The Vice-President on being elected may take his seat by the President, to aid him in the discharge of his duties; and he shall preside in the absence of the President from the chair. But the President shall appoint all committees, unless the House shall otherwise order. Before proceeding to other business a committee shall be appointed to wait upon the House of Bishops, and inform them of the organization of the House of Deputies and its readiness to proceed to business.

The Secretary shall keep full minutes of the proceedings of the House; transcribe them with all reports into a book provided for that purpose; preserve the Journal and Records of the House; deliver them to his successor, and perform such other duties as may be directed or assigned to him by the House. He may, with the approbation of the House, appoint an Assistant Secretary, and the Secretary and Assistant Secretary shall continue in office until the organization of the next Convention, and until their successors be chosen. If, during the recess of the General Convention, a vacancy should occur in the office of Secretary, the duties thereof shall devolve upon the Assistant Secretary, if there be one; if not, or if the Assistant Secretary shall die or resign, a Secretary shall be appointed by the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the next General Convention is to meet.

Sec. 2. In order to aid the Secretary in preparing the list specified in the preceding section, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese to forward to him as soon as may be practicable a copy of the Journal of the Diocesan Convention, together with a certified copy of the testimonials of members aforesaid. He shall also forward a duplicate copy of such testimonials to the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the next General Convention is to meet.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the House of Deputies and the Treasurer of the Convention, although not returned as Deputies to the Convention, shall be entitled to seats upon the floor of the House, and, with the approval of the President, to speak on the subjects of their respective offices.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred Message No. 8 from the House of Bishops, and four resolutions, all relating to the correction of supposed omissions or errors in the last edition of the Digest of the Canons, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That this House concurs with the House of Bishops in the adoption of the resolution communicated to this House in Message No. 8, relating to Canons 8 and 9 of Title I. of the Digest of 1868.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the numbers 5 and 7, in Subsection 4, of Section 8, of Canon 13, of Title I., be changed to 6 and 8 re-

spectively, so that the said Subsection may read as follows:

"4. Any Bishop or Bishops elected and consecrated under this section, or any Foreign Missionary Bishop heretofore consecrated, or any Bishop to whom the exercise of Episcopal powers and functions in a foreign Church or congregation shall have been assigned by the presiding Bishop, may ordain as deacons or presbyters, to officiate within the limits of their respective missions, or in such foreign Church or congregation, any persons, of the age required by the Canons of this Church, who shall exhibit to him or them the testimonials required by Canons 6 and 8 of this Title, signed by not less than two of the ordained missionaries of this Church who may be subject to his or their charge, or by two Presbyters of this Church, in good standing, connected with such foreign Church or congregation.

"Provided, nevertheless, that if there be only one ordained missionary attached to the mission, or only one Presbyter of this Church connected with such foreign Church or congregation, and capable of acting at the time, the signature of a Presbyter in good standing under the jurisdiction of any Bishop in communion with this Church may be admitted to supply the deficiency.

"In relation to the enquiry whether a subsection relating to the appointment of Lay Readers by the Bishop should not be added to Section 2, of Canon 9, of Title I, the Committee report as follows: From an examination of the printed Journals it would seem that such addition would be proper, the same having been adopted in this House and not appearing to have been stricken out by the House of Bishops. But upon examination of the enrolled copy of the Canon, as sent to the House of Bishops and preserved among its papers, it appears that the subsection in question was, through an error of the Clerk of this House, appended to the preceding question (that is, Section 2 of the Canon as it then stood), the whole of which section was struck out by the House of Bishops, which, of course, included said subsection. The Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject.

"In relation to the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II., by changing the word 'or,' in the fourth line, to 'and,' the Committee report that they are of the opinion that it is inexpedient, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II.

"The Committee have also considered the subject of the proposed repeal of Section 6, of Canon 13, of Title I, and are of the opinion that such repeal would be inexpedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed repeal of Section 6, of Canon 13, of Title I.

"By order of the Committee.

"WILLIAM COOPER MEAD,
"Chairman."

SECRET SESSION.

The secret session of the House lasted till four o'clock, when the House adjourned till ten o'clock to-morrow.

♦♦♦

TENTH DAY.

SATURDAY, October 17.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter

by Rev. William C. Crane, D.D., of Mississippi. The Lessons were read by Rev. David B. Knickerbacker, D.D., of Minnesota. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. John S. Kidney, D.D., of Minnesota. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., Bishop of Albany.

The Church having been cleared, the House resumed, with closed doors, the consideration of the matter under discussion yesterday.

FAMILIES OF DECEASED CLERGYMEN.

During the secret session a message (No. 22) was received from the House of Bishops announcing the passage by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Triennial Report of the Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen, etc., be communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

"Resolved, That this House has heard with great satisfaction the Triennial Report of the Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen, etc., and (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring) it is recommended to the Trustees to ascertain, by correspondence or otherwise, how many disabled clergymen of this Church are now destitute, and what provision has been made for destitute widows and orphans; and to adopt such other measures as in their judgment are wise to increase the fund, to accomplish more effectually the beneficent purposes for which they are organized, and to enliven the interest of the Church in the important subject committed to them."

On motion of Mr. OTIS, of Illinois, it was

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the recommendation communicated in the Message No. 22 from the House of Bishops transmitting the Triennial Report of the Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen and of Infirm and Disabled Clergymen."

While the doors were closed the following business of a public character was transacted:

DIVISION OF DIOCESE OF OHIO.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, from the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, submitted the following report, which was adopted:

"The Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, to whom was referred the memorial from the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio, asking the consent of the General Convention to the creation of a new Diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of Ohio, respectfully report:

"That having examined the documents committed to them, and found them to be correct, they recommend the adoption of the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, A request has been presented to the House of Deputies from the Diocese of Ohio that a new Diocese be erected in the present Diocese of Ohio, to be composed of that portion of the present Diocese of Ohio lying south of a line running along the south line of Mercer, Shelby, Logan, Union, Marion, Morrow, Knox, Coshocton, Tuscarora, Harrison, and Jefferson counties; and, whereas, it appears, by official documents laid before this House, that the Bishop of Ohio has consented to the erection of the said Diocese, and that all the requirements of the fifth article of the Constitution and of the Canons are fulfilled; therefore be it

"Resolved, That this House do concur in the action communicated to it in Message No. 11, from the House of Bishops, consenting to and ratifying the formation of the proposed new Diocese, and do hereby recognize the union with the General Convention of the new Diocese, so soon as it shall have been organized and named in Primary Convention, in compliance with Section 4, Canon 6, Title III."

DIVISION OF DIOCESE OF MICHIGAN.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, from the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, submitted the following report, which was adopted :

"The Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, to whom was referred the memorial from the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Michigan, asking the consent of the General Convention to the creation of a new Diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of Michigan, respectfully report :

"That having examined the documents committed to them, and found them to be correct, they recommend the adoption of the following preamble and resolution :

"Whereas, A request has been presented to the House of Deputies from the Diocese of Michigan, that a new Diocese be erected in the present Diocese of Michigan, to be composed of the Counties of Branch, St. Joseph, Cass, Berrien, Van Buren, Kalamazoo, Calhoun, Eaton, Barry, Ottawa, Kent, Allegan, Ionia, Montcalm, Muskegon, Oceana, Newaygo, Meconta, Isabella, Clare, Osceola, Lake, Mason, Manistee, Wexford, Missaukee, Kascaskia, Grand, Traverse, Benzie, Leelenaw, Antrim, Charlevoise, and Emmett ; and whereas it appears by official documents laid before this House that the Bishop of Michigan has consented to the erection of said Diocese, and that all the requirements of the fifth article of the Constitution and of the Canons are fulfilled, therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House do concur in the action communicated to it in Message No. 10, from the House of Bishops, consenting to and ratifying the formation of the proposed new Diocese, and do hereby recognize the union with the General Convention of the new Diocese, so soon as it shall have been organized and named in Primary Convention, in compliance with Canon 6, Section 4, Title III."

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

The Committee on Elections reported that they had granted leaves of absence to the following persons :

Rev. Charles A. Seymour, of Iowa, for to-day.

Rev. Julian Metcalf, of Nebraska, until Tuesday morning, October 20.

Mr. John L. Farwell, of New Hampshire, for a few days.

Rev. Daniel Goodwin, of Rhode Island, until Tuesday morning, October 20.

The report was adopted.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, it was

"Ordered, That the delegation of Wisconsin have leave to withdraw the papers asking for a division of that Diocese, in order to perfect them."

REPORT OF BOARD OF MISSIONS.

The Secretary presented the report of the Board of Missions and accompanying documents, which, on motion of Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia, were referred to the Committee on Missions.

SECRET SESSION ON MONDAY.

On motion of Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania, it was

"Ordered, That the House resume its secret session on Monday next at 12 o'clock."

TESTIMONIAL OF BISHOP WELLES.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I move that immediately after the recess the Convention proceed to sign the testimonials of the Bishop-elect of Wisconsin, in open session.

The motion was agreed to.

The Convention took a recess for half an hour, and reassembled at two o'clock P.M. in open session.

The testimonial of Rev. EDWARD R. WELLES, D.D., Bishop-elect of Wisconsin, having been signed by a constitutional majority of the members of the House present, on motion of Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia, it was

"Ordered, That the Secretary be instructed to transmit the said testimonial to the House of Bishops, the said testimonial having been signed by a constitutional majority, and in pursuance of an order of this House."

CHURCH MUSIC.

A message (No. 23) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption, by that House, of the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the following Canon be adopted :

"OF CHURCH MUSIC.

"It shall be the duty of every minister of this Church, with such assistance as he can obtain from persons skilled in music, to give order concerning the tunes to be sung at any time in his Church; and, especially, it shall be his duty to suppress all light and unseemly music, and all indecency and irreverence in the performance, by which vain and ungodly persons profane the service of the sanctuary.

"And, further, that this Canon be numbered Canon 21, of Title I., and that the present Canon be numbered Canon 22.

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That this Canon be printed in place of the resolution on the same subject heretofore prefixed to the Psalms in Metre and the Hymnal."

REDUCTION OF PRINTED JOURNAL.

A message (No. 24) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption, by that House, of the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That a Joint Committee be appointed to consider and report what measures are necessary to reduce the size and expense of the limited journal, and that the Committee on the part of this House consist of the Bishops of Central Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Massachusetts."

NEW YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

The PRESIDENT laid before the Convention the following invitation :

"The members of the House of Bishops and of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, now in session in this city, are respectfully invited to visit, at any time most agreeable to themselves, the Hall, Library, Museum of Antiquities, and Gallery of Art of the New York Historical Society, situated in Second Avenue, on the corner of Eleventh Street, and opposite St. Mark's Church. The library and collections of the Society are open every day (Sunday excepted) from 9 o'clock A.M. until 6 o'clock P.M.

"The simple announcement, at the door of the Hall, that the person presenting himself is a member of the Convention, will assure admittance.

"FREDERIC DE PEYSTER,
President.

"ANDREW WARNER,

Recording Secretary.

"October 17th, 1874."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The SECRETARY (Rev. William Stevens Perry, D.D., of Western New York). Mr. President, may I make a personal statement ?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

The SECRETARY. My attention has been called to an article in the *New York Times* which I only wish to speak of in reference to a certain portion thereof. The reporter, or author of the article, states that several Deputies condemned my "over-officiousness" in making the announcement in the lunch-room the other day cautioning Deputies that they were in the presence of reporters. I wish simply to state that I gave that caution not for my own personal wish, but at the request of the Lay Deputies of New York, who are charged with the enforcement of the law which this House has passed requiring secrecy in the matter before it.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. It was not condemnation, but approbation.

The SECRETARY. I only refer to the article because that statement was made. I hope I am understood. I do not care at all about the criticism of the *New York Times*, but only as to the condemnation of my course on the part of the Deputies.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF RULE ON SECRECY.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I give notice that on Monday I will offer a resolution to revoke Rule No. 17, which provides that, "whenever the election or confirmation of a Bishop is under consideration, the House shall sit with closed doors."

The PRESIDENT. Do you propose to revoke the rule entirely, or only for the present session?

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. For this present session. Under the rules, I have to give notice a day in advance, and this is the notice.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to and (at three o'clock P. M.) the House adjourned till Monday at ten o'clock A. M.

ELEVENTH DAY.

MONDAY, October 19.

The Convention assembled at St. John's Chapel at ten A. M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. S. M. Bird, of Texas. The Lessons were read by Rev. William G. Farrington, D. D., of New Jersey. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Walter R. Richardson, of Texas. The Benediction was pronounced by the Rt. Rev. Henry Champlin Lay, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Easton.

The minutes of the open session of Saturday last were read and approved.

CANON OF CHURCH MUSIC.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Message No. 22, from the House of Bishops, proposing the enactment of a Canon 'Of Church Music,' be taken from the Calendar and referred to the Committee on Canons."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Before that is taken from the Calendar, I think it is exceedingly important that the House should determine when it will commence night sessions. I would like, with the permission of the gentleman from Georgia, to be allowed merely to make a motion that, if our sessions continue over until next week, we then commence holding night sittings.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. This is merely a motion of reference to the Committee on Canons, not for any action.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Very well.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the message to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

NIGHT SESSIONS AND HOURS OF SITTING.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that, if

the House continue its sessions next week, we have sessions morning and night, and that the Board of Missions be notified thereof. It is exceedingly important, as that is the Missionary Council of our Church, that it should have time to perfect its deliberations; and, if we give it this notice to-day, it can certainly finish this week; and I do think those members who, like myself, are here at a very great inconvenience, will insist upon having night sessions next week. My motion, then, is, that next week we hold sessions at night, and that the Board of Missions be notified thereof at once.

Rev. Mr. BARBER, of Easton. I would suggest, in lieu of that motion, the following resolution, which I offer at the request of many members of the House:

"Resolved, That during the present week the House will hold evening sessions from 7:30 to 10 o'clock P. M."

This resolution is offered, Mr. President, in view of the absolute necessity, considering the pressure and urgency of business, that this step be taken; and the sooner we commence our night sessions the more rapid shall we be in the despatch of our business.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I wish to offer the following amendment to that: Strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

"That after to-day this House will sit in open session for the transaction of the general business of the Convention, daily, from 10 o'clock A. M. to 4 o'clock P. M., and that for the discussion of the question of consenting to the consecration of the Bishop-elect of Illinois, and for that only, this House will sit every night from 7 o'clock until 10 o'clock, unless sooner adjourned, beginning with to-night and continuing until the discussion is ended; and that at 12 o'clock meridian of the day next following the end of the discussion, this House will proceed to vote in open session on the question of consenting to the consecration of the said Bishop-elect of Illinois."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That comprises two subjects entirely unlike. If the gentleman presses it, I shall have to claim my right to insist upon a division of the question. It first provides when we shall have our night sessions, and next, what for. The first resolution that was offered was, that if this House continues in session next week it then hold sessions at night. The amendment, as I understood it, is that we commence at once holding night sessions. That will cut off the Board of Missions from their work, and we might as well resolve ourselves into professors of anatomy and suppose that the Church will live by making skeletons alone as to give up the Board of Missions. That subject can come up afterwards with very great propriety and be discussed, but the amendment will involve the subject now, and if the gentleman presses it I still ask for a division of the question.

Rev. Mr. BARBER, of Easton. I offered my resolution at the suggestion of many Deputies, especially lay members of the Convention. It provides, first, as to the question which now comes properly before us, whether we shall have evening sessions or not. Then, as to the business to occupy us in the evening sessions, that is a secondary consideration. It seems to me that the first question before us is whether, in the pressure of business now before the House, it is not obvious to every one that we ought to sit at night; and I apprehend that every member of the House will at once perceive that such a step is necessary, and necessary at once in order that our session may not be unreasonably protracted. Those who have attended the Conventions before are aware that, at the beginning of the third week, the members commence to fall off, the lay members especially, and the House must now transact the business that requires its attention. I submit, therefore, that the question is whether we shall

have any evening sessions or not. Subsequently we may consider the special order for those sessions.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I hope the resolution of the Deputy from Pennsylvania will not be adopted. The business of the Board of Missions is quite as important as anything that can come before this body for legislation. While that business is going on and progressing regularly, it will take all the time that can be given to the Board during the present week to bring it into proper order and shape. It will enlarge the operations of the Board, give greater interest, spread proper reports and proper intelligence of the operations of the Board of Missions for the entire Church. That is the work that is to be done. The true remedy is to limit speeches to fifteen minutes, and when that subject comes up I hope the speeches will be limited. You will not then need any night sessions. There have been ten days of this session, this is the eleventh day, I believe, and the session will probably not last longer than twenty days. I think that we must all see the necessity of saving time here on this floor, and not subtracting it from the necessary business of the Board of Missions.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I observed in the General Convention in Baltimore, as I observe here already, which I am very sorry to observe, a degree of restiveness under the idea of what might be called a prolonged session, that is, a few days longer than the sessions have generally been, and I hear gentlemen, such as my good friend from the Diocese of Pennsylvania, say that. I do not think that anybody ought to feel or to say that he is here under circumstances of great inconvenience. We are sent here once in three years for the purpose of discharging a great duty to the Church. No person has a right to accept that position unless he has duly intended in his own mind and heart to discharge it, and when he comes here he should not attempt to curtail the time for proper discussion and the consideration of such measures of importance as are brought before us, so as to make that consideration scanty.

I therefore deprecate most heartily the idea of persons pleading that they have got very important engagements elsewhere, and that therefore this session should be made very short. I claim that, next to a man's personal devotion to his God, there is no more important engagement he can have in this world than sitting in this body, and having the honor and privilege, as well as the responsible duty, of assisting in the legislation of this Church, and I therefore claim that, if our sessions, instead of being three weeks, are six weeks, it is not too much to ask of those who are sent here from the different Dioceses that they consecrate themselves with single heartiness and willingness, cheerfully and without making continued excuses and extenuations, to this work, and claiming that they ought to be at home instead of here; but, on the contrary, they should discharge that duty. I beg, therefore, to submit to my fellow-members that the question of inconvenience ought not to be pleaded in this House. I am very free to say, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, that I would rather attend a General Convention in San Francisco, than, living in Brooklyn, attend a Convention in New York. The personal inconvenience I can plead, having to take charge of my parish and a thousand other things appertaining to it, owing to my proximate residence, in connection with my duties here, and it makes it exceedingly inconvenient; but I do not dream of thinking that I must estimate that inconvenience in the discharge of my duty here. I knew it at the time I was elected, and I could have declined at the time, if I chose, but I did choose to incur the inconvenience, and therefore accepted the duty which my Diocese imposed upon me.

I proposed last week that we should have night sessions (not as a formal motion) in the discussion of the case of Dr. Seymour, so that the business of the Convention could go on regularly during the day in open session, and we could sit in the evening for this discussion. I did not press the motion. I merely rose to put it to the House, but there were cries of "no, no," and I concluded there was strong opposition to it, and therefore did not press it.

I think myself, from the gentlemen who have spoken on this floor, that it is unwise at this time. If we had begun last week, it would have been very well, because then business was scarcely inaugurated. Now, all that is preliminary has been gone through with, and to-night the Board of Missions begins to sit for the discharge of business that is important and imperative, and I do not think that this House ought, by a vote, make it the duty of those members who are also members of the Board of Missions to remain away from the Board to attend the sessions of this body. The Board of Missions has fixed its hour of sitting with reference to there being no evening sessions of the Convention, and their arrangements for business are laid out, their programme completed, for the whole week. I trust, therefore, that the House will not listen to the idea now, as I think it should have done last week. At this point, however, I am utterly opposed to night sessions now, and I think that in voting upon the resolution and amendment before us, the members will candidly weigh the words I have submitted with reference to a probable prolongation of this session particularly, as so many days of regular business have already been occupied upon the discussion of the matter of the consecration of Dr. Seymour.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I suggest to the gentleman from Easton that his amendment is altogether out of order. It raises two distinct propositions. One is that we sit in open session while the question of the consecration of the Bishop-elect is before the House, and the other is for evening sessions. One of these propositions is in the nature of a rule, and requires a two-thirds majority. The other proposition contemplates merely the continuance of the session in the evening, and does not require a two-thirds majority. Therefore, I think there can be no doubt the Chair will rule the amendment out of order.

As to the night sessions, I think it is proper, as the Board of Missions is a body not in the Convention, that it should have at least three days' notice of the purpose of this House to have night sessions, because it has hitherto transacted its business on the idea that the night would be for it, and many members of this body are members of that Board; and while we are only here for our work and continued work, I do not think it would be just and proper that the night sessions should be held sooner than Wednesday, so as to give the Board of Missions at least two nights.

Rev. Mr. BARBER, of Easton. I am willing to limit my resolution so as to read that "on and after Wednesday next this House will hold night sessions."

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I will then ask the Chair to rule the amendment of the gentleman from Easton (Mr. Stearns) out of order. I ask the gentleman to withdraw the amendment in order to allow a direct vote on the question of night sessions. In addition to that, I would remark that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Blair) gave notice on Saturday that he would offer a proposition to repeal the seventeenth rule, which requires a secret session for assenting to the consecration of Bishops; and for that one reason I would suggest to the gentleman to withdraw his motion which contemplates the raising of that question.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. If I am out of order I am willing to withdraw my amendment on

the question of secret sessions. It only provided that when we take the vote it shall be taken in open session; and in regard to the discussion, it does not touch upon that at all. My object was to provide, just as the House of Representatives in Congress provides, for those who want to talk upon a certain subject after the evidence is all in, and when we have already made up our minds, and can see no new evidence for some two or three days back, that they may have the opportunity to discuss this question at night, and say what they please to say, and yet the business of this House go on. It does seem to me, if we adopt this amendment of mine, we can go on with the regular business of the House during the day session, and after to-day the Convention will meet simply for the purpose of that discussion, and, I suppose, members of the Board of Missions, most of them, do not care about it; they have made up their minds so far as the evidence is already in, and there seems no likelihood of new evidence coming in. That is the sole object of my amendment.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. What was the original motion?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. To commence night sessions next week.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. And to give notice to the Board of Missions immediately, so that they may prepare themselves.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. The third amendment was the amendment of the gentleman from Easton (Rev. Dr. Stearns), to have the discussion on the consecration of the Bishop-elect of Illinois at night. My motion is to lay that on the table.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I call for the reading of that resolution, so that we may understand what it is.

The SECRETARY. Rev. Dr. Stearns, of Easton, moves to strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert as follows:

"That after to-day this House will sit in open session for the transaction of the general business of the Convention, daily from ten o'clock A.M. to four o'clock P.M., and that for the discussion of the consenting to the consecration of the Bishop-elect of Illinois, and for that only, this House will sit every night from seven o'clock till ten, unless sooner adjourned, beginning with to-night, and continuing till the discussion is ended, and that at twelve o'clock meridian, on the day next following the end of the discussion, this House will proceed to vote in open session on the question of consenting to the consecration of the said Bishop-elect of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on laying the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Easton (Rev. Mr. Barber).

Rev. Mr. BARBER, of Easton. I accept the suggestion of my friend from Virginia, that after Wednesday next we hold evening sessions, so that it shall read:

"Resolved, That after Wednesday next the House shall hold evening sessions from 7:30 to 10 P.M."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. That is for general business?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, for all business.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I have not had the fortune to hear what has been said on this matter; but I wish to say a word to the House. The Board of Missions has a very important work to do in this Church. It does nearly all the work for the most of the Territory of the Church on this continent, and it

does a very large share of work in every Diocese. There is scarcely a Diocese that does not have help from the Board of Missions. Now, what we shall do here depends very much on what the Board of Missions does in its sessions. All the outlying Dioceses of the Church can send their Deputies to this Convention as Deputies to that Board of Missions. If you so arrange it that this House shall sit when that Board is sitting, you either take the Deputies from this House or you take them from that. I do not believe that it is for the interest of the Church that either of these great bodies shall be deprived of their efficient men. I hope, at any rate, for this reason, that the Board of Missions will be allowed to go on at night, and that our House will only hold day sessions. I am not willing to lose my place on the floor of the Board of Missions. We are greatly interested in its work. I am not willing to lose my place on this floor. We are greatly interested in the work here, and my Diocese has the right to my vote in each place. What is true in my case is true in the case of every outlying, far-away Diocese which has jurisdiction in the Church. Therefore I hope we shall refuse to commence our evening sessions in this House on Thursday next. It is a very short time to give the Board of Missions, only this week, but let them have this week in full.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Easton (Rev. Mr. Barber), to hold night sessions after Wednesday.

The amendment was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the motion of Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania, to commence night sessions next week, provided the House remains in session so long, and to give notice of that resolution to the Board of Missions.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I shall vote for that resolution, but I would prefer that the mover would change it so that our sessions, during the day, this week, shall extend to 5 o'clock.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I am perfectly willing to make that motion afterwards.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. We have a lunch in this building, and come here to do business. Now, the gentleman across the way (Rev. Dr. Schenck) talks about sitting here six weeks.

The PRESIDENT. Let that come up afterwards. The question now is on the motion of the Deputy from Pennsylvania to hold night sessions next week, and that notice of the fact be given to the Board of Missions at once.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the day sessions hereafter, during this week, be from nine and one-half in the morning till five in the afternoon. If gentlemen want to work they can do it. I know the objection is on account of the committees, but the committees can sit at night as well as the Board of Missions. We are at work till half-past ten, and they can work too.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Except Saturday.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I do not think the Deputy from Pennsylvania ought to exclude from the Board of Missions men who are upon the committees. I think that the members who are willing to meet at nine o'clock on committees ought at least to have the privilege of going to the Board of Missions at night, with other members of that Board. I therefore hope the gentleman will modify his motion.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I am willing to modify my motion, and to make the daily sessions from ten to five o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion as modified to provide that the sessions of this House be from ten till five o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That includes today and excepts Saturday?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

SECRET SESSIONS.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I ask now that the House take up and consider the resolution which I gave notice of on Saturday to abolish the seventeenth rule imposing secrecy upon our sessions in relation to assenting to the consecration of Bishops. I do not think this will cause any debate. I do not propose to say anything, and I do not think it necessary to say anything to the House on this subject. If gentlemen are not convinced by the experience we have had of the inconvenience of holding these sessions in secret, nothing I can say can change their opinion, and therefore I do not propose to debate the question unless somebody else shall do so. I ask for the question on my resolution.

The PRESIDENT. I hope the question may be put at once. It is of no use to debate it. Every man has made up his mind. The Secretary will please read the resolution.

The SECRETARY. Mr. Blair, of Maryland, moves the striking out of the rule of order number 17.

The question being put, a division was called for, which resulted, ayes 92, noes 95. So the motion was not agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. A Deputy is on the floor.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a question with respect to the vote just taken. I desire to know whether every member was required to vote.

The PRESIDENT. It is impossible for the Chair to answer the question.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The rule of order provides that the members of the Convention shall vote.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir; and if you knew of any body who was not voting, it was your duty to call the attention of the House to the fact then. The vote has now been announced, and is final.

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, submitted the following:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Burr, of Ohio, as to the expediency of proposing an amendment to the Constitution reducing the number of Clerical and Lay Deputies from each Diocese, and the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of Connecticut, as to the expediency of rearranging the same on a new basis of representation, respectfully report that such amendments, in their opinion, would be inexpedient at the present time, and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

CHARLES H. HALL, Chairman, etc.
BENJ. A. ROGERS,
GEO. F. COMSTOCK,
E. T. WILDER,
J. W. STEVENSON,
EDWARD MCCRADY,
G. W. RACE,
T. U. DUDLEY, Jr."

BISHOPS OFFICIATING IN OTHER DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I beg leave, as I am up, to offer the following resolution, to be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the alteration of Article IV. of the Constitution, proposed in the last General Convention, and made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, and printed on pages 160, 341, and 357 of the Journal of the last General Convention, be, and the same is hereby, finally agreed to and ratified as provided in Article IX. of the Constitution."

The amendment is in regard to a Diocese with a Bishop, as well as a Diocese without a Bishop, asking help from a neighboring Bishop. I think there need be no discussion on the merits, as it will come up on the resolution when brought back from the Committee. The amendment was passed by the last General Convention, and has been sent down to the Dioceses, and simply awaits ratification. My motion is that the matter be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSIONARY JURISDICTIONS OUT OF DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Committee reported, the other day, that the change of Article V. of the Constitution, proposed by the last House of Deputies, had lapsed by default, by accident. I now offer the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be made known to the different Diocesan Conventions."

This is the old form, and I propose to renew the old form, making the motion in order to make the form exactly agree with the article of the Constitution and prevent doubt.

"Resolved, That it be made known to the different Diocesan Conventions that it is proposed, in the next General Convention, to consider and determine on the following proposed alterations to the General Constitution of the Church, viz.:

"That Article V. be amended by adding the following words at the end of the same, to wit:

"The General Convention may, upon the application of the Bishop and Convention of an organized Diocese, setting forth that the territory of the Diocese is too large for due Episcopal supervision by the Bishop of such Diocese, set off a portion of such Diocesan territory, which shall thereupon be placed within or constitute a Missionary Jurisdiction, as the House of Bishops may determine."

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I would ask one question. Was not that passed by the last House of Deputies and sent up to the House of Bishops?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir, but it must be sent down the second time, because of the failure to perfect the matter.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. It seems to me that the House is the judge as to whether that was a failure or not. As I understand, some of the best lawyers in the House are of the opinion that it was no failure.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That whole question comes up, under the order of the House, at two o'clock this afternoon. This motion, as I understand, is simply to refer this motion now made by the gentleman to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. It will then be reached and disposed of by the House.

The motion to refer was agreed to.

REDUCTION OF PRINTED JOURNAL.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Message No. 24 from the House of Bishops, proposing the appointment of a Joint Committee to consider and report measures for the reduction and size of the printed Journal, be taken

from the Calendar, and that the House concur therein, and that a committee of two Clerical and two Lay Deputies be appointed by the Chair, who, together with the Secretary of this House, shall compose the Committee."

The House of Bishops sent this proposition to this House on Saturday, and I merely call it up.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Expenses. They have already had it under consideration.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I accept that amendment.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Would it not be better to pass a resolution :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Expenses be the Joint Committee on the part of this House."

Referring it to them is one thing, and constituting them a Joint Committee is another.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Would it do to make the Committee on Expenses that Committee to confer with the House of Bishops?

The PRESIDENT. The resolution of the House of Bishops is to refer to a committee of four on the part of this House to confer with their Committee. The Committee on Expenses is a committee of thirteen.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. It is the understanding that the motion is to refer to the Committee on Expenses as a joint committee on the part of this House.

The PRESIDENT. Read the resolution.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I understood it simply to refer to the Committee on Expenses to consider whether we should agree to the appointment of such a joint committee.

The PRESIDENT. That was the understanding, but it is now changed.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I so understood it. The gentleman proposed this amendment, and I accepted it, supposing it was to come into mine. I supposed that was what it meant.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Massachusetts I think it was who moved that the Committee on Expenses be the Joint Committee on the part of this House.

Mr. SHATTUCK. That was my amendment; but I withdraw mine, and second the resolution of Rev. Dr. Williams.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I have changed my resolution by striking out so much of it as provides for appointing a joint committee on the part of this House, to consist of two Clerical and two Lay Deputies, and inserting, "the Committee on Expenses be the members of the Committee on the part of this House."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution as modified.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I wish to give notice of a proposed amendment to the rules of order by adding to Rule 12 the following :

"All messages from the House of Bishops communicating any legislative action on their part shall, without debate, be referred to the proper committee."

TRUSTEES OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS' FUND.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York, from the Committee on the State of the Church, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on the State of the Church respectfully report that in conformity with the requirement of Section 1, Canon 3, Title III, of the Digest, the Committee nominate the following five

laymen to constitute a Board of Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund, viz.,

Mr. Cambridge Livingston, of the Diocese of New York.

Mr. Henry Meigs, of the Diocese of New Jersey.

Mr. John B. Stebbins, of the Diocese of Massachusetts.

Mr. William H. Battle, LL.D., of the Diocese of North Carolina.

Mr. Lewis N. Whittle, of the Diocese of Georgia.

All which is respectfully submitted.

"The Committee further express their regret that so little, we understand less than \$300, has been contributed to this important fund during the past three years, and they recommend the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund are requested to issue a circular annually to the rectors of all our parishes asking an offering for this fund."

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. If the House listened attentively to the report of the Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund, they will remember that less than \$300 are reported as having been offered, thus showing that the Canon is virtually a dead letter on our statutes. The Committee simply recommend the issuing of a circular by which the attention of the Church shall be called to the importance of this fund.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. I move the adoption of that report, and that the nominations be confirmed.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. This is the same Board of Trustees that were appointed at the last General Convention, and have acted during the interim.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fairbanks].

The motion was agreed to.

STATE OF THE CHURCH.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. We have another report. I will ask my colleague, Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, of the Diocese of New Jersey, to read it.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey, read the following report :

"The Committee on the State of the Church would respectfully report that great inconvenience has been felt by your Committee on account of the delay in the reception of the Journals and other documents provided by Canon for the use of this Committee, and that the delay has been occasioned in part by the omission of a fixed date for presenting the said Journals and documents, and the need of an imperative Canon on this subject.

"In view of this, the Committee would recommend the passage of the following resolutions :

"Resolved, That Section 4, of Canon 15, of Title I, be amended by inserting after the words 'at every General Convention' the words 'on or before the first Monday of the session.'

"Resolved, That Section 5, of Canon 15, of Title I, be amended by striking out the words, 'It is recommended that,' and inserting instead thereof the words, 'It shall be the duty of'; and after the words 'within the Diocese,' inserting the words, 'and present the same to the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on or before the first Monday of the session.'

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDENT. According to the rule, resolutions reported by the Committee will be placed on the Calendar, to be taken up in order, when reached.

ACTION ON BISHOPS' MESSAGES.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, from the Com-

mittee on Canons, submitted the following report, which was placed upon the Calendar;

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Messages Nos. 12, 13, 16, and 17, from the House of Bishops, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the House concur in the first two of the said messages, and do not concur in the two last, as expressed in the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment of Subsection 4, of Section 7, of Canon 12, of Title I., proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 12.

"2. Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment of Section 1, Canon 4, of Title I., proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 13.

"3. Resolved, That this House does not concur in the amendments of Canon 13 of Title I., proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 16.

"4. Resolved, That this House does not concur in the amendment of Section 2, of Canon 11, of Title II., proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 17."

HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I propose an amendment to the third article of the Constitution which I desire the Secretary to read; and I move its reference to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I desire simply to say a word or two under the five-minutes rule in explanation of my proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Mr. Montgomery, of Georgia, proposes the following substitute for Article 3 of the Constitution, and moves its reference to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Whenever a General Convention is held, the Bishops, when three or more are present, shall form a separate House, with the right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of Clergy and Laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon; and all the acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses. And in all cases the House of Bishops shall signify to the House of Deputies their approbation or disapprobation (together with their reasons in writing), within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof it shall have the operation of law, unless the Convention shall finally adjourn within three days after such proposed act shall have been reported to the House of Bishops, in which event the act proposed shall be inoperative.

"The three days herein allowed the House of Bishops for the consideration of a proposed act of the House of Deputies, shall commence to be counted at 12 o'clock meridian on the first day in which the House of Bishops is in session, after the reception of the proposed act. *Provided*, the proposed act is received before that hour; otherwise the counting shall begin at 12 o'clock meridian on the next succeeding day in which the House of Bishops shall be in session.

"When less than three Bishops attend the General Convention, the one or two who may be present shall be members, or members *ex officio*, of the House of Deputies, with the right to vote, and a Bishop shall then preside."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. The proposed amendment is to provide for a difficulty which is now before us. When a Canon or resolution of this House goes before the House of Bishops, and the Convention finally adjourns before the three days expires, what is to become of the action of this House? It is insisted, by one portion of the

House, that it has the operation of law, and so our Secretary seems to think in his book giving us a succinct history of the Conventions of our Church, and so the House of Bishops seem to have thought in 1853. It strikes me that this is altogether an erroneous view of the law, and my proposal is to settle this question. It would be treating the House of Bishops unfairly, as the Houses are now constituted, to throw before that body a large amount of new business within three days of the adjournment. It strikes me that they ought to have more than three days; but I did not feel authorized to propose an alteration of the Constitution, further than to remove this difficulty, and to get rid of that part of the article which has become obsolete. As it now reads, the article requires the House of Bishops to report "to the Convention" within three days. Its framers undoubtedly meant "the House of Deputies," and I have altered that; and in order that there may be no difficulty hereafter on this point, I have fixed a definite time at which the three days shall commence to count. Whenever a resolution or Canon goes to the House of Bishops, the period is to commence at twelve o'clock on that day, unless it be received after that hour, and then from twelve o'clock, not of the next succeeding day, but of the next succeeding day in which the House of Bishops may be in session, because we may send to them on Saturday afternoon, and then Sunday would count as part of the three days; and it strikes me that three days of full consideration are little enough for the House of Bishops; or, for some reason, they might adjourn over Monday, and that would give them but one day for the consideration of the action of this House. I propose, therefore, to give them the full three days. In other respects, the article is as already published.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the proposed substitute for Article 3 of the Constitution to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF MISSIONS.

The Secretary presented the triennial report of the Board of Missions, which, on motion of Rev. Dr. Cady, of New York, was referred to the Committee on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.

STATUS OF BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution, which I wish to have referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and the Committee on Canons:

'Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to enquire and report to this House what amendments, if any, may be necessary to equalize the *status* of all the Bishops of this Church having either Diocesan or Missionary jurisdiction, for the purpose of securing to all alike the following franchises, namely:

"1. That all have seats in the House of Bishops upon the same terms of membership.

"2. That all may be eligible and transferable to any of the duly constituted jurisdictions of the Church, whether Diocesan or Missionary, to which they may be elected or appointed.

"3. That all shall have, so far as it is practicable under the circumstances, the same jurisdictional organization; to the effect that the co-ordinate ecclesiastical authority of a standing committee may be the same in missionary jurisdictions as in Dioceses.

"4. That the titular distinction between Diocesan Bishops and Missionary Bishops be abrogated, and the latter be styled Bishops of such or such Missionary Jurisdictions.

"And that the foregoing resolution and its several

specifications be also referred to the Committee on Canons, to report to this House what new Canon, changes, or amendments may be necessary to carry the same into effect."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I suggest to the gentleman that that resolution had better go to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution alone.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Very well, but I proposed submitting it to both those Committees because the resolutions—

The PRESIDENT. There is no time for discussion now. There is only time enough left to take the vote on the motion to refer. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. It is twelve o'clock, and the hour for proceeding to the consideration of the order of the day has arrived.

MINISTERS OFFICIATING IN OTHERS' CURES.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Before the doors are closed, I wish to offer an amendment to Section 6, of Canon 12, of Title I, entitled "Officiating of Ministers within the Cures of others."

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be requested to consider the expediency of amending Canon 12 by striking out Subsection 1 of Section 6, or by adding thereto the following :

"This Canon shall not apply to clergymen ministering to their own parishioners in special services, such as baptisms, marriages, or burials, wherever they may be required."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

NEW DIOCESES.

On motion of Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, the House of Bishops was requested to return Messages Nos. 17 and 18, being the action of the House of Deputies on the proposed division of the Dioceses of Ohio and Michigan.

THE SECRET SESSION.

The hour of twelve having arrived, the chapel was cleared of all persons except members of the House of Deputies. The House remained in secret session till near five o'clock, when it adjourned till to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M.

TWELFTH DAY.

TUESDAY, October 20.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter, by Rev. Alexander C. Garrett, D.D., of Nebraska. The Lessons were read by Rev. G. Jarvis Geer, D.D., of New York. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Aldert Smedes, D.D., of North Carolina. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. Thomas March Clark, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDENT. I am informed by the Secretary (and it must be obvious to all of us that the thing must be so) that we are getting so far behind hand on the Calendar in view of the utter indefiniteness of the disposition of the present order of the day, that we ought to have made some order last evening, such as that which was made on Saturday, to sit for miscellaneous business until twelve o'clock, the regular time for the order of the day. I would suggest, if it meet the approval of the House, that some member make a motion to that effect now. It can be carried by a two-thirds vote,

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I make that motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House continue in open session for miscellaneous and regular business until twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to *nem. con.*

The minutes of yesterday's open session were read and approved.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEPUTIES.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Elections beg leave to report that they have received satisfactory evidence of the due appointment of the Rev. John D. McCullough, as a supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of South Carolina, in the place of the Rev. P. J. Shand, D.D., who has withdrawn from the House, and of Mr. John Stennis as a supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of Rhode Island, in place of Mr. Claudius B. Farnsworth."

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I am instructed by the Committee on Canons to move that the standing order which was reported by them two or three days ago, relative to the organization of the House, be recommitted to the Committee on Canons. I now make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NICENE CREED.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut, from the Committee on the Prayer-Book, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on the Prayer-Book, to whom were referred sundry memorials from the Dioceses of Alabama, Albany, Arkansas, Connecticut, Easton, Mississippi, Pittsburgh, Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin—all in nearly the same language, and 'petitioning this Body to take such measures as in their wisdom may seem proper towards securing for use in Divine Worship an English version of the Creed commonly called the Nicene, as conformable as may be to the original text'—have had the same under careful consideration, and have reached a conclusion unfavorable to granting the prayer of the memorialists.

"The reasons assigned for a new translation revolve in a circle, and centre about the *Filioque*. It is true that these words were not in the Catholic Creed of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople; but since they have been so long used by the Western Church, and are explicable in an orthodox sense, it would not become this body to enter upon measures for revising the Creed with the view of striking them out of, or of 'securing an English version,' as conformable as may be to the original text, until it can be done in conjunction with the Church of England and other Churches in communion with the same, and with this Church.

"The Committee, therefore, respectfully submit for adoption the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this Church ought not to enter upon any consideration of the proposition to revise the Nicene Creed, until it can be done in some United Council of all those autonomous Churches using the English rite, and in communion with this Church and the Church of England."

DECEASED MEMBERS.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Memorial of Deceased Members respectfully report : At the meeting for organization, after deliberation, the Committee decided that such memorial as they might prepare should have reference only to members of the House

of Deputies, and be confined to those of the last and of the present Convention, deceased before the presentation of the report. This appeared to be the only decision the Committee could reach under their appointment, unless special instructions be given by the House. The Committee are aware that this course will exclude all reference in their memorial to any of the nine Bishops whose useful and noble lives on earth have closed during the past three years, and also to more than one member of the House of Deputies previous to 1871, who have commanded through consecutive sessions the respect of their fellows, and have had a large part in establishing the Canon Law and in promoting the growth and prosperity of the Church.

Before proceeding to their memorial, the Committee recall the past thirty years, which includes twelve sessions of the House. Of ninety-three Clerical Deputies present in the session of 1844, thirty-two are still living, but only six are members of the present House: Rev. Drs. Mead, Chase, Wilson, Berkley, Scott, and Burgess; of the Lay Deputies, but four are now upon our roll, Messrs. H. J. Bodley, C. C. Trowbridge, H. P. Baldwin, P. E. Demill. But five of the Bishops consecrated in 1844 are members of the Upper House. Six clergymen and six laymen, members of the last House of Deputies, during the recess have been called to the rest of Paradise, and three, one Presbyterian and two Laymen, members-elect to the present House.

I. But few months had elapsed after the adjournment of the General Convention of 1871, when the first break occurred in the circle of the members. Mr. JOHN DUNCAN, of Mississippi, twice a Deputy to the Convention, died early in 1872, aged about 60 years. He was a highly esteemed citizen, a valued friend and counsellor, a zealous and trusted communicant of the Church, and his departure is widely regretted.

II. In the early part of October, of 1872, GEORGE ANDERSON GORDON, of Alabama, followed to the hidden world, at the early age of 42 years. He had attained eminence as a lawyer and held firmly the confidence of his fellow-citizens. He gave his services, with much zeal and skill, as Superintendent of Sunday-schools, and in many Church works was as the right hand of his rector.

III. After the lapse of but a few weeks, December 5, 1872, the Diocese of Western New York, as well as the entire State, was called to grieve over the death of THOMAS A. JOHNSON, LL.D. He had been elected a Justice of the Supreme Court of New York for three successive terms of eight years each. His last election was without opposition. He was a member of this House in 1868 and 1871. He was an accomplished scholar, a learned jurist, a laborious, wise, incorruptible Judge, a pure and good man. He loved the Church, and freely gave his time and talents to her service. At the age of threescore and ten he went to the Christian's rest.

IV. On the 12th of December, 1872, Rev. N. W. TAYLOR ROOT, a Deputy in the last Convention, from Maine, bowed beneath a very distressing disease, at the age of 41 years. His ministry had been for about fourteen years, and chiefly spent in Rhode Island. He had attained reputation as a brilliant writer and preacher, and as a pastor he has left a record of laborious and successful service. His service in this House was confined to the session of 1871.

V. On January 27, 1873, the next of our House was called to Paradise, WILLIAM THOMPSON READ, of the Diocese of Delaware. He departed full of Christian honor at the age of 81 years. He had been a member of this House for eleven consecutive sessions. He was ever distinguished for an intelligent and humble sacrifice of himself to the service in the Church of our Lord Jesus.

VI. On the morning of Ash Wednesday, 1873, entered into rest the Rev. CHARLES B. DANA, D.D., of Mississippi, a member of this House in 1871 and in 1868. Dr. Dana was ordained Deacon and Priest by Bishop Moore, of Virginia, in 1834 and 1835. He was rector of Christ Church, Alexandria, from 1834 to 1861, and afterwards his labors were in Mississippi. Dr. Dana was truly "an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile," a man of great purity of character, and simplicity of manner, a thorough Christian gentleman, loyal to the Church in all her requirements, a ripe scholar, a model pastor, and an edifying teacher.

VII. Rev. FRANCIS R. HANSON, of Alabama, was relieved from earthly service on October 21, 1873. He had attained to more than seventy years, and had been for forty of them a Presbyterian of the Diocese of Alabama. Early in life he labored as a missionary of the Church in the foreign field, but for the larger part of his ministry as a parish Priest; he served with unusual unselfishness, purity, and devotion, and cleaving closely to his people in great adversities. He was a member of the House in four Conventions.

VIII. Near the close of the autumn of 1873 RICHARD D. MOORE, M.D., a Deputy in 1871 from Georgia, was added to the list of deceased members. He had passed more than sixty years. He was a true man, a loyal son of the Church, an humble and devoted servant of our Lord.

IX. In December, 1873, after a short illness, another valued son of the Church's ministry laid down his earthly duties. Rev. SAMUEL B. BABCOCK, D.D., of Mass., was in several sessions a member of this House. He labored in a single parish for forty years, and gathered to himself such character and influence as belong to a brave conscientiousness, to diligence, patience, zeal, abounding tenderness, in a word, to fidelity to the Lord and to men. A life so worthy claims a revered memory.

X. On February 21, 1874, closed the earthly life of Rev. RICHARD S. MASON, D.D., of North Carolina, at about fourscore. His first attendance as a member of this House was in 1841, and he has been a Deputy from that Diocese on every occasion of its representation until this year. For more than fifty-six years he served our Lord in the ministry of His Church. With the exception of a few years in the office of President of Geneva College, New York, and of Newark College, Delaware, he was rector in North Carolina. He was a man of extensive and accurate learning, with a happy facility of bringing it into practical use. He was an able minister of the New Testament and a faithful pastor. He was distinguished for simplicity and godly sincerity, for purity and honesty. No earthly consideration of gain or loss could have tempted him to stray from integrity and duty. Dr. Mason was born in the Island of Barbadoes in 1795, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1811, was ordained Deacon by Bishop White in 1817, and priest by Bishop Ruland C. Moore in 1820.

XI. In the early part of the year 1874, SAMUEL F. PATTERSON, Lay Deputy in 1871 from the Diocese of North Carolina, departed this life. He was born in the State of Virginia, but removed to North Carolina while he was quite a young man, and passed his long and useful life in the western part of the State. He filled many offices of high responsibility, and was always distinguished for the purity of his character and the integrity of his life. He was a devoted Churchman, and after having attained the age of three score years and ten, he died universally lamented.

XII. On April 19, 1874, another valued laborer was called away from us—Rev. ABNER JACKSON, D.D., LL.D., a Deputy from Connecticut, and Chairman of the Committee on Christian Education. Dr.

Jackson was born November 4, 1811, in Pennsylvania. He graduated in 1837 from Trinity College, Hartford, with the highest honors, and entered immediately after upon the office of tutor in the same college. In 1838 he became Professor of Ancient Languages. He was ordained by Bishop Brownell in the same year. Twenty years later he became President of Hobart College. After filling that position for nine years he returned to Trinity College as its President, and died in that service. Dr. Jackson was a noble type of the Christian scholar. For nearly forty years he was engaged in the great work of education. He was a careful and thorough student of literature, science, and theology. He was unusually popular with his associates and the students. His influence over the latter was such as can come only from a living Christian example and a loving guide. He had broad sympathies, but he never permitted them to destroy his sense of justice, his conviction of duty, or his reverence for principle. He has left a noble record.

XIII. Now, in the autumn of 1874, three Deputies-elect are added to the list of the dead. By a singular and sad accident, on the evening of September 15, 1874, the Rev. FREDERICK BROOKS, of Ohio, sank to death beneath the waters of Boston Harbor. He was a young man, thirty-two years of age, among the very youngest of the members elected to this House; yet he had won his way to more than one position of responsibility in his own Diocese. He will be remembered as a successful pastor, a scholar of ability, and a thinker of prominence. The beauty and hope of Israel are fallen.

XIV. But four days before the opening of this Convention, PETER W. GRAY, Deputy-elect from the Diocese of Texas, died at his residence in that State. From the organization of the Diocese, twenty-five years since, he has occupied places of trust, and was a member of this House in 1871 and 1859. He filled for a time the office of Judge of the Supreme Court in Texas till compelled by feeble health to resign, and was held in honor by the people. As a Churchman he showed himself earnest for the Lord, faithful to Him, and true to His cause. His age was fifty-five.

XV. Since the present session of the Convention opened, Major JOSIAH HUNT, Deputy-elect from the Diocese of Missouri, has died suddenly, at the age of about fifty-five. He pursued for many years the profession of civil engineer, and latterly that of banker. He was a sterling Churchman, much esteemed, and wholly trusted. His gifts and labors will be sadly missed throughout the Diocese.

The Committee recommend that the House adopt the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the reported memorial of the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members be printed as an appendix to the Journal of this House.

Resolved, That this House mourn the decease from the Church militant of these faithful soldiers and earnest followers of the Lord.

Resolved, That this House holds their memory in reverence, and desires to place on record its estimate of their worth and service; and, while blessing God for them, prays for grace to follow their good examples, and with them to become partners of the heavenly kingdom.

For the Committee,

Respectfully submitted,

ALEXANDER BURGESS,

Chairman.

CAMBRIDGE LIVINGSTON, Secretary.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I beg leave to suggest that the name of General Samuel F. Patterson, a Deputy from the Diocese of North Carolina in 1871, is omitted. He was a man of the highest respectability. I wish to add his name to those recorded in the report.

The PRESIDENT. I was about to suggest that we take the vote immediately on these resolutions, and take it standing, but as there is already proposed one amendment, and there may be others, I suppose that the report had better go upon the Calendar, in order that proper amendments may be made before it is taken up.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that it be recommitted, because it had better be made complete before it comes to us.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the report be recommitted.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the House that this report is longer than we had designed to make it, but it was quite as short as we were able to make it this year, there seemed to be so much that could be said, and it seemed to be desirable that there should be a record of dates connected with the report. The Committee made all the enquiry they could; but, as it appears, they have omitted one case, and made an error in another. These can readily be corrected.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is to recommit the report for the purpose of perfecting it.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I have a memorial.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. I was absent at a meeting of the Committee on the State of the Church when that Committee was called for a report. I ask the privilege of now presenting it.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. The memorial I present is on the subject of Ritual. I ask its reference to the Committee on Prayer-Book.

The PRESIDENT. Will the Chairman of the Committee on the State of the Church allow that memorial to be presented?

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky, presented the following memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book:

"The memorial of the undersigned, lay communicants of the Church, respectfully sheweth:

"That your Memorialists fear it is intended to propose at the next session of your body some action which will abridge the liberty heretofore enjoyed by the clergy and laity of the Church, and your Memorialists earnestly deprecate any such action, for the following reasons:

"1. Because any legislation on Ritual can only be effected by changing the Prayer-Book. The law on the subject of Ritual rests upon Rubric and not upon Canon; and any alteration of the Prayer-Book, and especially during a time of great and general agitation, might be injurious to other and more important interests.

"2. Because it does not appear that Ritual has manifested any such power of growth during the past six years as to justify anxiety as to its future; while during the same period there has been manifested a strong tendency in all parts of the Church to conform more exactly to the order of the Prayer-Book, and to increase the dignity and solemnity of the services of the Church.

"3. Because any one who examines the statistics of the Church for the last thirty or forty years will find that her marvellous growth, and the development of her life in its various forms, have been concurrent with the increase of reverence and devotion. The increase of communicants upon population during the past six years will be found to have been greater than at any period in the history of the Church.

"4. Because the Catholic Church has always included men of many minds, united in agreement on the essentials of the faith and in submission to Apostolic order, and is comprehensive of different schools and parties; if, therefore, it be thought necessary to restrain Ritual, it will be needful to establish a rule of absolute uniformity, and to bring sharply up to that standard those who fall below. Your Memorialists conceive that this policy would be most inexpedient, and that it is not desirable to force congregations to accept a Ritual to which they are unused and opposed.

"5. Because as our doctrinal and ritual systems are very closely united, there can be no legislation on Ritual without danger of unsettling doctrine.

"6. Because as the subject of Ritualism has been fully discussed and considered in two General Conventions to the exclusion of matters of greater practical concern, and the result of their united wisdom has been to take no action, such wisdom having been indicated by the fact that no such evils have arisen as were predicted or feared, it seems to your Memorialists that there should be an end to agitation.

"Your Memorialists, therefore, humbly pray that no change may be made in the law of this Church relating to the celebration of Divine Service, but that the same liberty continue to be enjoyed as heretofore within the limits of the Book of Common Prayer, and under the same Episcopal authority that has heretofore been exercised in this Church.

SILAS F. MILLER.
MARGARET MILLER.
MARY J. MILLER.
JEANNIE M. MILLER.
J. V. COWLING.
H. W. COWLING.
MRS. J. S. MOORE.
A. F. MOORE.
MOLLIE T. MOORE.
J. M. BODINE.
MARY E. BODINE.
E. C. BODINE.
L. D. HAMPTON.
W. R. JOHNSON.
F. H. JOHNSON.
E. H. WARFIELD.

FRANK W. MAURY.
S. E. TSCHIFFELY.
F. G. BOLSFORD.
OLIVE S. BOLSFORD.
JOSEPH BENEDICT.
MASON MAURY.
JOHN B. WOOD.
SALLIE S. MAURY.
MATTIE F. MAURY.
E. C. HUDSON.
MARY DELANO.
E. G. NASH.
GEORGE CROSS.
R. M. KELLY.
NETTIE W. KELLY.
SALLIES. WARFIELD.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. I present a memorial from the Convention of the Diocese of Tennessee, unanimously adopted, for the repeal of the proviso attached to Article 5 of the Constitution by the last General Convention, requiring satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese when one is formed—a pecuniary provision or price upon the formation of a new Diocese, which was never before incorporated in the legislation of this or any other Church. The most concise statement of the grounds of this application will be made by having the Secretary read the memorial, which is brief, and will not occupy the five minutes allowed me in presenting it.

The SECRETARY read the memorial as follows: "Memorial to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America:

"That the provision contained in Article 5 of the Constitution, whatever may be its value in reference to the older and stronger Dioceses, must necessarily operate as an absolute prohibition of the erection of new Dioceses in those parts of the United States where the growth of the Church is retarded by the great extent of territory and sparseness of population, rendering due Episcopal oversight always difficult, and to a considerable degree impracticable, and where the work is altogether of a missionary character.

"To require of the impoverished Church in the

South and Southwest, feeble in strength and numbers at best, the raising of an Episcopate Fund sufficient to support a proposed new Episcopate, is imposing a condition precedent impossible to be met. Very few of the Dioceses where such division is most imperatively demanded for the growth and extension of the Church have ever been able to provide an endowment or Episcopal Fund; and we believe that no new Diocese would be attempted to be established without provision in some form for the support of its Episcopate, the existing proviso requiring satisfactory assurance of such provision, which has been construed to mean by endowment, and of the 'suitableness' or extent of which the General Convention, and not the Diocese, is made the judge, would effectually prevent, in most cases, even the effort to obtain such division. The Diocese of Tennessee has been for many years looking forward to a division of its very extensive jurisdiction; but under this proviso, if an Episcopate Fund is requisite, we regard the matter as impracticable for many years at least. Out of forty-one Dioceses now in existence in this country, but thirteen have an Episcopate Fund of \$30,000, and but seven have a fund of over \$40,000. The great majority of the Dioceses support their Bishops by assessments upon the parishes, and your memorialists believe that if this matter of the support of the Bishops were to be left as formerly, to those who are directly interested in the question, there will be no lack of sufficient, suitable, and cheerful provision for such support.

"Your memorialists, therefore, would respectfully urge upon the General Convention of the Church the amendment of Article 5 by the omission of the following words: 'And such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese.'

"Resolved, That the Deputies to the next General Convention from the Diocese of Tennessee be instructed to present this memorial, and to request action in accordance therewith."

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

ERECTION OF CHURCHES.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York, from the Committee on the State of the Church, reported that the Committee had passed the following resolution, and presented it for the consideration of the House:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the State of the Church recommend to the General Convention to take such measures as in their wisdom they may deem best, to encourage the formation of associations, general and diocesan, to aid in the erection of Churches, whereby the bounty of the Church in this direction may be called out in larger measure, and greater confidence inspired in its application."

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. In connection with that report, Mr. President, I would state that when a report was made yesterday by my colleague, Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, of New Jersey, in regard to an amendment of the Canons, it was, by oversight, not referred to the Committee on Canons. He desires to have the privilege of making a motion of reference.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman desires to have the report made yesterday referred to the Committee on Canons?

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the report made yesterday by Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, from the Committee on the State of the Church, be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF BISHOP McILVAINE.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. I offer the following: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to remove from the scene of his earthly life and labors the Right Rev. Charles Pettit McIlvaine, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio;

"Be it Resolved, That this House do hereby make solemn record of the event which has deprived the Church of one of its brightest lights, and left a shadow not soon to be dispelled; at the same time this House would express a sense of profound gratitude to the Great Disposer of events that this eminent servant of the Church was spared through a ministry of fifty-three years, more than forty of which were spent in the Episcopate, to labor so abundantly and effectively for the advance and spread of the Gospel of Christ and the extension of His Church, and by his holy life to adorn the doctrines of God our Saviour."

I do not propose, sir, to occupy the attention of the House in more than a very few words. The subject of the resolution does not need eulogy; his record is on high, but there is an honored custom which has prevailed for a long time, perhaps from the beginning of our Church organization here, of putting on our records some testimonial, some memorial of those who have departed this life—the distinguished members of the Church—the eminent servants of God who have gone to their rest and their reward. We have many such—more to record at this Convention than ever before. Nine of our honored and right reverend fathers have entered into their rest since our last session. I simply bring forward one honored name to be put upon our records, that it may be transmitted as far as we can transmit it on our records. The memories of these eminent fathers of the Church ought to be very precious to us; their examples should be kept constantly before our minds; and I think, if we here would think more of them, it would go far to sanctify our proceedings and give effect to all we do. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. Mr. President, while I concur very cordially in all that my brother has said in relation to the subject of this resolution, I would respectfully suggest to him that it has not been the custom of this House to take definite action in regard to each particular death in the House of Bishops; but the Committee on the State of the Church at the close of the session has usually made reference to those several cases of mortality, and offered proper remarks on the subject. I would therefore respectfully suggest that it would be more proper, perhaps, to have the resolution referred to the Committee on the State of the Church, as there will be eight others to be noticed; and if remarks should follow, as they probably would in each case, a great deal of our time would be occupied, while the Committee on the State of the Church could readily include them all in their report.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. I have no objection to that, but I see no reason why the House should not take separate action upon memorial resolutions. I remember distinct resolutions in regard to Bishop Kemper and other Bishops, and as I supposed that to be the general and prevailing custom, I took the liberty of offering this resolution. I have no objection, however, to its being referred to the Committee on the State of the Church.

The PRESIDENT. I would remind the venerable Presbyter from Ohio that it was on account of the time taken up at the last Convention in regard to these brethren deceased, that the standing Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members was appointed and made a permanent Committee of this House,

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. That relates to members of this House.

The PRESIDENT. Yes; but the same principle applies, of course, to members of the other House. If you accept the suggestion of the Deputy from Central New York, I will put the question in that form.

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. I have no objection to accepting it, provided the memorial resolution goes on our Journal.

The PRESIDENT. It will certainly go there.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. My impression is that the Committee on the State of the Church usually name each individual in their report. I now hold in my hand another resolution referring to the late Bishop of Iowa, so that there would seem to be a propriety in referring all such resolutions to the Committee on the State of the Church.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the two resolutions just offered be referred to the Committee on the State of the Church.

The motion was agreed to.

ALMS-BASIN PRESENTED TO ENGLISH CHURCH.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I beg the indulgence of yourself, Mr. President, and of the House, to read in your hearing a letter received from the Archbishop of Canterbury with reference to the presentation of an alms-basin from the members of this Convention to the Church of England. I ask it as an indulgence because the act of presentation was not the joint act of our body, but was the act of individual members of the body and did not come before the House for any corporate action. This letter and this act are associated with the late Right Rev. Bishop of Ohio, Bishop McIlvaine. I may take occasion to say here, in order to give my report to the members of this House, which I have never been able to do until this moment, that this basin was procured from the Messrs. Kirk, of the city of Baltimore; the price of it was one thousand dollars, and it is said to be the finest piece of work of silver and gold and precious stones combined, that has ever been made upon our continent. It was sent through the hands of the Bishop of Lichfield, who presented it on bended knees to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be placed upon the altar of St. Paul's Cathedral, and in this basin the Bishops of the Church of England made their own offerings first. It is understood that the basin is to be preserved by the Archbishop and transmitted to his successors, to be used in all future times at the consecration of English Bishops and the opening of the Houses of Convocation, and upon all public great occasions in which the Church of England is interested, and to be preserved as a pledge and token of unity and good-will between our own Church and our Mother Church of England.

I may say here, too, that both Houses of the Convocation, by resolution adopted unanimously, went in their scarlet Convocation robes from their sittings in the Chamber near Westminster Abbey, in solemn procession, to the celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral, especially to do honor to the American Church, and in this procession Bishop McIlvaine and the Lord Bishop of Lichfield carried our basin, and it was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in form. Nothing could have been more hearty and gracious than their acceptance and their treatment of this token and expression of our good-will. Here let me say that the idea of presenting this token was suggested to me by my presence, in 1852, in the grounds of Exeter College in the University of Oxford, seeing with the delegation which we sent over by invitation on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, when

members of the University and of the Church of England presented such a basin to our own Church, which we use at the opening of this Convention and at the opening of the sessions of the Board of Missions. This is an acknowledgment and a reciprocal act in return for what we first received from them. I call on the Secretary to read the letter.

The SECRETARY read as follows :

"LAMBETH PALACE, S.E., Aug. 8, 1872.

"RT. REV. AND DEAR BROTHER :

"I have to announce to you that both Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury have unanimously passed the following resolution :

"That this House requests its President to allow his address, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on the occasion of the presentation of the alms-basin, to be communicated synodically to the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

"In accordance with this resolution, I beg leave to forward to you a copy of the few words which, at the celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral, I addressed to the Bishop of Lichfield and the congregation of Clergy and Laity assembled on the very interesting occasion of the presentation of the gift sent by the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to the mother Church of England. You have already received by telegram an account of the proceedings of that important day. The words which I spoke were as follows :

"In virtue of my office, I am commissioned on this occasion to represent the Church of England. I receive this offering of love from our sister Church beyond the Atlantic, and I beg all of you who are here present, and all Christian people, to unite in your prayers to Almighty God that the richest blessings of his Holy Spirit may descend upon our brethren who thus express to us their Christian love, that for ages to come these two Churches and these two great nations, united in one worship of our one Lord in one faith, as they are sprung from one blood, may be the instruments under the protection of our Gracious Redeemer of spreading his Gospel throughout the world, and securing the blessings of Christian civilization for the human race.

"I beg that you will assure the Committee of which you are a member, and the Houses of the General Convention of your Church, how highly prized by all English Churchmen has been the expression of regard which you have commissioned the Bishop of Lichfield to communicate to us. We beg heartily to thank the members of your Church for the kind reception accorded to our brethren who represented us in October of last year.

"The beautiful present, expressive of your kindly, Christian regard, has been deposited in my keeping to be used at the most solemn ceremonies of our Church in Lambeth Chapel, and elsewhere; and I trust it will ever remain in the hands of my successors, a pledge of that Christian love which binds together the daughter and the mother Church.

"I remain, Rt. Rev. and dear brother,

"Your faithful brother and servant in Christ,

"A. C. CANTUAR, [Seal]

"Primate of all England and Metropolitan.

"The Right Rev. HORATIO POTTER,

"Bishop of New York."

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I would simply say that the Bishop of New York kindly allowed me to use his name as chairman of our Committee, he furnishing the letter of presentation addressed to the Archbishop. I also was kindly allowed to use the name of the Rt. Rev. Bishop McCoskry, of Michigan, and also of the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania, Mr. William Welsh, the Com-

mittee consisting of two members of each House, and this letter of the Archbishop was read yesterday in the House of Bishops, and is now properly before the Convention.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Does the gentleman offer any resolutions?

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I would move simply that this correspondence be placed on our Journal. It does not properly belong to the House, being the act of individual members of the House; but I would ask as a matter of courtesy that it be placed in the appendix to the Journal.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. There was an omission in the way the gentleman made his statement. He said that the basin was sent to the Bishop of Lichfield for presentation to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was the case, - but Bishop McIlvaine being there at the time, the gentleman may remember the fact that he took hold of one side of the basin and the Bishop of Lichfield of the other, and that it was a joint presentation to the Archbishop of Canterbury. That point was omitted in the gentleman's remarks just now.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. One gentleman being on one knee and the other one standing, as I happened to see.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. It only has this significance, that the Prelates of these churches united in the presentation, whether they were standing up or sitting down.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the correspondence be printed in the appendix to the Journal.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSIONARY TERRITORY FORMED FROM A DIOCESE.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to which was referred a resolution directing them to consider and report to this Convention whether any Constitutional amendment is necessary to empower the General Convention of this Church to set off a missionary territory from the bounds of a Diocese, at the request of said Diocese, duly made known, have given full consideration to the subject, and respectfully report :

"That there is no provision whatever upon the subject of missions in the Constitution of the Church. The only provision for either foreign or domestic missions made by the Church is by the several Canons : Title I., Canon 13, "Of Bishops," Sections 7, 8, and Title III., Canon 9, "Of the Board of Missions." The sections of Canon 13, Title I., relate to the election of Missionary Bishops, and to the duties, rights, and privileges of these Bishops, the first of these sections (Section 7) relating to Domestic Missionary Bishops, and the second (Section 8) relating to Foreign Missionary Bishops. The last clause in each of these sections requires the Missionary Bishop to report to each General Convention his proceedings, and the state and condition of his field of mission work, and once a year, at least, to report to the Board of Missions. Canon 9, of Title III., which was first adopted in 1871, by its Section 1, Clause 1, makes it the duty of the General Convention, at every triennial meeting, on nomination by a joint committee of the two Houses, designated for that purpose, to appoint a Board of Missions for the management of the General Missions, Foreign and Domestic, of this Church. The second clause [2] of this section makes all the Bishops of this Church *ex-officio* members of this Board, and provides that the elective members shall be selected from the Presbyters and Laymen of the several Dioceses in such numerical proportion as shall from time to time be determined. Section 2 authorizes the

Board of Missions to adopt a constitution and modify the same as occasion may require :

"Provided, That such Constitution and Amendments shall be of no force until the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the General Convention. And Section 3 directs that the Board of Missions shall make report of its doings to every Triennial General Convention. This last Canon, Canon 9, Title III., was adopted at our last General Convention, very plainly for the purpose of incorporating the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which had existed for a long time before, into the Church, and uniting the Society and the Church in and by means of the Board of Missions, as their agent for conducting and controlling missions. This Constitution, originally framed in 1823, was repeatedly amended, the last amendment being made and approved by the Convention of 1871, and at that time, as your Committee believe, first ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the Journal of the Convention. It appears to have been considered necessary (probably to claim the right to and management of funds and property) to preserve the existence of the Society while it was substantially brought under the control of the General Convention by the terms of its own Constitution. The Society was declared to comprehend all persons members of this Church, and the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, therein provided for, was entrusted with the exercise of all the corporate powers of the institution, subject to the General Convention and within the limitations contained in the said Constitution and any amendments thereafter made in the same. This Constitution also provides for the election and constitution of the Board of Missions so as to give the General Convention the control of it, and in its Article IV. declares : 'To the Board of Missions shall be entrusted the supervision of the general missionary operations of the Church, with power to establish missionary stations, appoint missionaries, make appropriations of money, regulate the conducting of missions . . . and to enact all by-laws which they may deem necessary for their own government and the government of their committees : Provided always, That in relation to organized Dioceses having Bishops, the Board shall regulate the number of missionary stations, and, with the consent of the Bishop, shall select the stations.

"Article 11, for the guidance of the Committee, declares that the missionary field is always to be regarded as one—the world—and Article 12 forbids any missionary to 'be sent to officiate in any Diocese without the consent of the ecclesiastical authority of the same.'

"These Canons, and the Constitution of the Society approved by our Conventions, all clearly show that there was nothing to prevent the Board of Missions temporarily occupying as missionary ground any portion of an organized Diocese, with the consent of the Bishop and its Convention. Indeed, by Section 16, of Title I. (2) a Diocese without a Bishop, or whose Bishop is under judicial disability, may by its Convention alone be placed under the full Episcopal charge and authority of a Missionary Bishop. In 1868-1871, a portion of the Diocese of Nebraska, the Indian Reservation within its territory, its Bishop and Convention concurring, or requesting, was united with other Indian territory and created a new missionary jurisdiction or district, under the name of Niobrara, by resolution only, and this House elected the Bishop nominated to them by the House of Bishops without any objection whatever.

"The Committee are of opinion, therefore, that it

does not require an Amendment of the Constitution to empower the General Convention, through the agency of the Board of Missions, and by the processes marked out in the Canons and in the Constitution of the Society, which may be considered to be the Constitution of the Board of Missions, with the consent of the Bishop and Conventions of any organized Diocese, to occupy or set apart any portion of such Diocese as missionary ground.

"This would be a full response to the terms of the resolution referred to the committee, but it is proper to point out that this does not recognize the right of the Convention, even with the consent or at the request of the Bishop and Convention of any Diocese, permanently to dismember a Diocese. Your Committee are induced to add this because it has come to their knowledge that perhaps something like this has very innocently been done, but without any committal of the Convention to its lawfulness.

"CH. H. HALL, Chairman.
T. U. DUDLEY, Jr.
BENJ. A. ROGERS.
ISAAC HAZELHURST.
GEO. F. COMSTOCK.
G. W. RACE.
E. T. WILDER.
SAMUEL B. RUGGLES.
EDWARD MCCRADY.
J. W. STEVENSON.
EDMUND H. BENNETT.
W. F. BULLOCK."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move, sir, that the House agree to this report.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is there no resolution appended to it?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. No, sir.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If I understand the report rightly, the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution are clearly of the opinion that this House, with the consent of the House of Bishops and the Board of Missions, have a right to allow, if any Bishop desires it, a certain portion of his Diocese to be set off and become a missionary jurisdiction and to elect a Bishop therefor. Do I understand rightly?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I imagine that is about it.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. But the Committee have prepared no resolution to submit to the House.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. As I understand, after our discussion whether there should be a resolution or not proposed to this House, we concluded that the proper time for debating that question will be when the nomination of a Bishop is made to us. We are asked a question as to the construction of the Constitution. We give an answer. The House may agree to it now or not, or may agree to it then or not. We have nothing to propose. The matter as to how it shall be done does not belong to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. The Diocese of Texas for years has been put off all the time, and has naturally become somewhat impatient. The Diocese of California stands very much in the same relation. The Committee think they see a way by which this can be done by the proper Committee and by the proper authority, not looking upon themselves as the proper Committee to elaborate the exact process by which it shall be accomplished. I make the motion that the report be agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I would modify the motion by saying simply that the principles be approved, and the report placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have to object. I object to the House now committing itself without further examination.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. If there is objection, it goes on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The report goes on the Calendar without any motion to that effect.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move, then, that it come up with the other question involving the same principle which now stands at the head of the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I hope that will be done.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Permit me to read a rule of order:

"All reports recommending or requiring any action or expression of opinion by the House shall be accompanied by a resolution for the action of the House thereon."

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I move to print the report just made, and hope it will be done. It is a matter of great importance, and while I favor it entirely if it can be done constitutionally, it is a very serious question. It is very late in the day now for us first to have discovered that we can lay aside the Constitution, and act by Canon on the subject. I admit that the Constitution of the Church is very defective and very meagre; but that is a question which ought to be seriously considered, and the members of the House ought to have an opportunity of looking into it individually before they act upon it. I hope the motion to print will be put.

The motion to print the report was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I rise for information. I understood that report was to go on the Calendar. I do not understand that any report, unaccompanied by a resolution, can go on the Calendar. It is important that committees may know when they bring in a report that unless they have a resolution attached to that report, it cannot go on the Calendar and come up again.

The PRESIDENT. The motion was that it should go on the Calendar. That makes it a resolution and brings it within the rule.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 25) was received from the House of Bishops returning to the House of Deputies, in accordance with its request, its Messages Nos. 17 and 18.

A message (No. 26) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur in Message No. 21 from the House of Deputies nominating a Board of Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I ask permission to present, at this time, a few short reports from the Committee on Canons, which were not ready when that Committee was called this morning. They will take no time now, as we simply wish to have them go down upon the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will receive the reports, if there be no objection.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, from the Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed amendment of the Standing Order relating to Deputies of Missionary Jurisdictions, reported that they had considered the same, and were of opinion that it was inexpedient, and therefore recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to the Standing Order 'Of Deputies from Missionary Jurisdictions.'"

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, from the Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed Canon "Of the Presiding Bishop," reported that, having considered the same, they were of opinion that its passage was inexpedient, and they therefore recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed Canon 'Of the Presiding Bishop.'"

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, from the Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 9 of the House of Bishops, reported for adoption the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur in the amendment of Subsection 6, of Section 7, of Canon 13, of Title I, relating to Standing Committees of Missionary Jurisdictions, proposed to this House in Message No. 9 from the House of Bishops."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

COURT OF APPEALS.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I also submit the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a memorial from Rev. John A. Wilson and others, asking, among other things, for such legislation as shall result in the establishment of a court of final appeals, respectfully report that they are of opinion that this subject should rather be referred to and considered by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of a court of final appeals."

In connection with this last report, Mr. President, I was instructed by the Committee to ask the adoption of this resolution now, and then to make a motion that the matter be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, so that no time may be lost in getting the matter before that Committee, which the Committee on Canons consider to be the proper Committee to have charge of the subject. I therefore move the passage of the resolution presented by the Committee on Canons.

The resolution was passed.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I now move that the subject be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

NEW DIOCESES IN OHIO AND MICHIGAN.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the action of the House, which may, I hope, give rise to no debate, upon the two resolutions sent up to the House of Bishops, which, at our request, have just been returned. Those resolutions have reference to the erection of new Dioceses in Michigan and Ohio. If the House will remember, it was a vote of concurrence with the House of Bishops in that matter. The House of Bishops took exception to the addition of a clause thereto. I will read one of the resolutions. The other corresponds *totidem verbis*:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the action communicated to it in Message No. 10 from the House of Bishops, consenting to and ratifying the formation of the proposed new Diocese within the Diocese of Michigan."

So far, the House of Bishops think we ought to have gone, and no further. The remaining clause is:

"And do hereby recognize the union with the General Convention of the said new Diocese, so soon as it shall have been organized and named in Primary Convention, in compliance with Section 4, Canon 6, Title III."

The Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses thought it well to add that clause, because they were applied to in every one of these cases to fix some period. It seemed to the Committee that the Canon on that subject fixes in general terms a period at which they would become connected with the General Convention, and that that period was, when they were organized, in Primary Convention, and were named in that Convention. The House of Bishops, however, think that this addition is an amendment to their resolution, and it is now before the House. The Committee are quite willing to recall that clause. It will merely involve the striking out of the last clause,

The PRESIDENT. Do you make that motion?

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the last clause in the resolution in each case be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

The resolutions, as amended, were agreed to.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary wishes to make a statement to the House.

The SECRETARY. I very earnestly beg the permission of the House to retain my Assistant Secretaries during the secret session. We have now twelve messages to go to the House of Bishops. We possibly may have testimonials to prepare. It is impossible for me to do the work of three gentlemen, and I am sure we can trust the honor of these gentlemen as well as we can the honor of any members of the House. They are clergymen of standing and reputation, and I beg that they may be allowed to attend during the secret sessions for the furtherance of the business of the House.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that permission be given.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois, and others called for the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. The hour having arrived for the order of the day, persons not members of the House will retire.

THIRTEENTH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, October 21.

Morning Prayer was begun by Rev. Henry S. Getz, of Pittsburgh, and concluded by Rev. Sterling Y. McMasters, D.D., LL.D., of Minnesota. The Litany was said by Rev. Isaac G. Hubbard, D.D., of New Hampshire. The Benediction was pronounced by Right Rev. J. P. B. Wilmer, D.D., Bishop of Louisiana.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

A message (No. 30) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), 1. That Section 1, of Canon 4, of Title II. be amended by substituting in place of the words 'make application to the Bishop of the Diocese who shall,' these words following, 'refer the matter to the Bishop of the Diocese who may'; 2. that Section 3 of the same Canon be amended by inserting after the words 'until he shall retract his refusal,' these words following, 'and if he persist in his refusal it shall be the duty of the Bishop to dissolve the connection between the rector and vestry or congrega-

tion; 3. That Section 8 of the same Canon be amended to read, 'Section 8. This Canon shall not be obligatory upon any Diocese which has made or shall hereafter make provision by Canon upon this subject, or with whose laws or charter it may interfere; 4. That Section 5 of the same Canon be and is hereby repealed, and that the remaining sections be numbered accordingly."

DETACHMENT OF SANTEE RESERVATION.

A message (No. 31) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following preambles and resolutions:

"Whereas, The Council of the Diocese of Nebraska, at the motion and with the consent of the Bishop of Nebraska, has, by the necessary constitutional action, consented to the detachment of the Santee Indian reservation, situated in the Diocese of Nebraska, for the purpose of transferring the same to the Missionary Jurisdiction of Niobrara; and, whereas, it may be questioned whether such detachment be complete or lawful without the approval of the General Convention; therefore

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the consent of the General Convention is hereby given to the detachment of the said Santee Indian reservation from the Diocese of Nebraska and for its transfer to the Missionary Jurisdiction of Niobrara."

THE HYMNAL.

A message (No. 32) from the House of Bishops announced the passage by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That future editions of the Hymnal shall be printed so as to conform to the revised edition presented by the Joint Committee on the Hymnal, and that no other hymns be allowed in the public worship of the Church except the Hymnal as thus revised, and such hymns and psalms as are now ordinarily bound up with the Book of Common Prayer, provided that any congregation may continue to use the editions of the Hymnal heretofore published, until further action of the Convention.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Hymnal, in pursuance of their own request, be discharged.

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has also adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops desires here to place upon record their sense of the singular zeal and assiduity of the Joint Committee in the laborious task confided to them for the sound discretion which they have exhibited, and of their patience and kindness in considering objections, and in endeavoring to meet the wishes of the Church, and that a copy of this resolution be communicated to the House of Deputies."

The Chapel, having been cleared of all but Deputies, the House resumed its secret session, and continued to sit with closed doors till the hour of adjournment, and at five o'clock P.M. adjourned till to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M.

FOURTEENTH DAY.

THURSDAY, October 22.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Daniel Henshaw, of Rhode Island. The Lessons were read by Rev. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. William C. Gray, of Tennessee. The Benediction was pronounced by

Right Rev. William Henry Odenheimer, D.D.,
Bishop of New Jersey.

COURT OF APPEALS.

A message (No. 33) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the following amendment of the Constitution be proposed in this General Convention, and made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, viz., that the sixth article of the Constitution be amended by the addition of the following clause:

"Appeal from the judgment of the Diocesan Court may be provided for by the General Convention."

LESSONS FOR LENT.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York, submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee to whom was assigned by the last General Convention the preparation of a Table of Lessons for the week-days of Lent, beg leave to report the accompanying table and resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Table of Lessons reported by the Committee be authorized for use till the next General Convention, provided the same shall be approved by the Bishop of each Diocese or jurisdiction respectively.

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee be continued in charge of this matter for its more thorough consideration, and to afford opportunity for such improvements as may be suggested by its actual use.

"The Committee would add, that while engaged in the duty assigned to them, they have also prepared a Table of Lessons for the Ember and Rogation Days, regarding this, though not specified, as embraced in the spirit and aim of the resolution under which they were appointed, and recommend the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Table of Lessons for the Ember and Rogation Days herewith presented by the Committee be authorized for use on the conditions, as the Table of Lessons for Lent.

"ALEXANDER GREGG,
J. FREEMAN YOUNG,
M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE,
T. W. COIT,
ALFRED B. BEACH,
E. E. BEARDSLEY,
I. G. HUBBARD,
CHARLES R. HALE."

A TABLE OF LESSONS FOR LENT.

Ash-Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Isaiah 58 to v. 13; Second Lesson, Mark 2, v. 13 to v. 23. Evening: First Lesson, Jonah 3; Second Lesson, Heb. 12, v. 3 to v. 18.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 1; Second Lesson, John 4, v. 5 to v. 27. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 1 to v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 1 to v. 12.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 2; Second Lesson, Luke 4, v. 14 to v. 33. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 1, v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 1, v. 12.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 3; Second Lesson, John 5, v. 16 to v. 33. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 2; Second Lesson, Revelation 2 to v. 12.

First Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Jeremiah 7; Second Lesson, Matthew 10. Evening: First Lesson, Jeremiah 9; Second Lesson, Ephesians 4.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson: Job 6 to v. 14; Second Lesson, John 5, v. 30. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 3 to v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 2, v. 12.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 6, v. 14; Second Lesson, Matthew 11, v. 11. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 3, v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 3 to v. 14.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 7; Second Lesson, Luke 12 to v. 22. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 8; Second Lesson, Revelation 3, v. 14.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 9 to v. 13; Second Lesson, Luke 12, v. 22 to v. 41. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 9; Second Lesson, Revelation 4.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 9, v. 13; Second Lesson, Luke 12, v. 41. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 11, v. 14; Second Lesson, Revelation 5.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 10; Second Lesson, Mark 4, v. 21 to v. 35. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 12, v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 6 to v. 9.

Second Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Ezekiel 14; Second Lesson, Luke 10 to v. 25. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 18; Second Lesson, Ephesians 5.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 12; Second Lesson, Matthew 13, v. 36 to v. 53. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 13 to v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 6, v. 9.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 13 to v. 14; Second Lesson, John 6, v. 27 to v. 40. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 13, v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 7.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job. 13, v. 14; Second Lesson, John 6, v. 40. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 8.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 14; Second Lesson, Mark 7 to v. 24. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 16, v. 44 to v. 55; Second Lesson, Revelation 9 to v. 13.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 16; Second Lesson, Matthew 16 to v. 13. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 16, v. 55; Second Lesson, Revelation 9, v. 13.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 17; Second Lesson, Matthew 16, v. 13. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 17 to v. 11; Second Lesson, Revelation 10.

Third Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Ezekiel 20 to v. 27; Second Lesson, Mark 9 to v. 30. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 20, v. 27; Second Lesson, Ephesians 6.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 19; Second Lesson, Matthew 18, v. 7 to v. 21. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 17, v. 11; Second Lesson, Revelation 11.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 21; Second Lesson, John 7, v. 14 to v. 32; Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 22, v. 12 to v. 23; Second Lesson, Revelation 12 to v. 9.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 23; Second Lesson, John 8, v. 12 to v. 31. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 22, v. 23; Second Lesson, Revelation 12, v. 7.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 24; Second Lesson, John 8, v. 31 to v. 46. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 24, v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 13 to v. 9.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 26; Second Lesson, John 10, v. 22. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 26; Second Lesson, Revelation 13, v. 9.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 27; Second Lesson, Luke 11 to v. 27. Evening: First Lesson,

son, Ezekiel 27 to v. 26; Second Lesson, Revelation 14 to v. 12.

Fourth Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Micah 6; Second Lesson, Luke 19, v. 28. Evening: First Lesson, Habakkuk 3; Second Lesson, Philippians 1.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 28; Second Lesson, Luke 11, v. 27. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 27, v. 26; Second Lesson, Revelation 14, v. 12.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 29; Second Lesson, Luke 13, v. 22. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 28 to v. 20; Second Lesson, Revelation 15.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 30 to v. 15; Second Lesson, Luke 15, v. 11. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 31; Second Lesson, Revelation 16 to v. 12.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 30, v. 15; Second Lesson, Luke 17, v. 20. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 32 to v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 16, v. 12.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 31 to v. 24; Second Lesson, Mark 10, v. 13 to v. 32. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 33 to v. 21; Second Lesson, Revelation 18 to v. 15.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 31, v. 24; Second Lesson, Mark 10, v. 32 to v. 46. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 33, v. 21; Second Lesson, Revelation 18, v. 15.

Fifth Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Haggai 2 to v. 10; Second Lesson, Luke 21. Evening: First Lesson, Zechariah 13; Second Lesson, Philippians 3.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 38 to v. 19; Second Lesson, Luke 19, v. 11 to v. 28. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 34 to v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 19.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 38, v. 19; Second Lesson, John 12, v. 23 to v. 37. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 34, v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 20.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 39; Second Lesson, Matthew 21, v. 23 to v. 33. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 36, v. 16 to v. 33; Second Lesson, Revelation 21 to v. 15.

Thursday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 40; Second Lesson, Mark 12 to v. 13. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 37 to v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 21, v. 15.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 41; Second Lesson, Matthew 25 to v. 31. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 37, v. 15; Second Lesson, Revelation 22 to v. 10.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 42; Second Lesson, Matthew 25, v. 31. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 47 to v. 13; Second Lesson, Revelation 22, v. 10.

Sixth Sunday in Lent. Morning: First Lesson, Daniel 9; Second Lesson, Matthew 26. Evening: First Lesson, Malachi 3 and 4; Second Lesson, Hebrews 5 to v. 11.

Monday in Holy Week. Morning: First Lesson, Lamentations 1 to v. 15; Second Lesson, John 14 to v. 15. Evening: First Lesson, Lamentations 2, v. 13; Second Lesson, John 14, v. 15.

Tuesday in Holy Week. Morning: First Lesson, Lamentations 3 to v. 34; Second Lesson, John 15 to v. 17. Evening: First Lesson, Lamentations 3, v. 34; Second Lesson, John 15, v. 14.

Wednesday in Holy Week. Morning: First Lesson, Lamentations 4 to v. 21; Second Lesson, John 16 to v. 16. Evening: First Lesson, Hosea 12; Second Lesson, John 16, v. 16.

Thursday in Holy Week. Morning: First Lesson, Hosea 13 to v. 15; Second Lesson, John 17. Evening: First Lesson, Hosea 14; Second Lesson, John 13 to v. 36.

Good Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Genesis 22 to v. 20; Second Lesson, John 18. Evening: First Lesson, Isaiah 52, v. 13 and 53; Second Lesson, 1 Peter 2.

Easter Eve. Morning: First Lesson, Zechariah 9; Second Lesson, Luke 23, v. 50. Evening: First Lesson, Hosea 5, v. 8 to 6, v. 4; Second Lesson, Romans 6 to v. 14.

EMBER DAYS.

In Advent.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Isaiah 40 to v. 12; Second Lesson, John 1, v. 19 to v. 35. Evening: First Lesson, Isaiah 52 to v. 13; Second Lesson, 2 Corinthians 4.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Jeremiah 23, v. 16. Second Lesson, John 5, v. 33. Evening: First Lesson, Hosea 4 to v. 10. Second Lesson, 1 Thessalonians 5.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Malachi 3 42 v. 16; Second Lesson, Matthew 24, v. to. Evening: First Lesson, Malachi 3, v. 16 and 4; Second Lesson, Titus 2.

In Lent.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 7; Second Lesson, Luke 12 to v. 22. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 8; Second Lesson, Revelation 3, v. 14.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 9, v. 13; Second Lesson, Luke 12, v. 41. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 11, v. 14; Second Lesson, Revelation 5.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Job 10; Second Lesson, Mark 4, v. 21 to v. 35. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 12, v. 17; Second Lesson, Revelation 6 to v. 9.

In Whitsun Week.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Deuteronomy 18, v. 15; Second Lesson, Matthew 10, v. 16. Evening: First Lesson, 1 Kings 19; Second Lesson, 1 Cor. 1, v. 18.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, 2 Kings 2 to v. 23; Second Lesson, John 15, v. 16. Evening: First Lesson, Isaiah 6 to v. 19; Second Lesson, 1 Cor. 2.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Isaiah 61; Second Lesson, John 16, to v. 15. Evening: First Lesson, Joel 2, v. 15; Second Lesson, 1 Cor. 12 to v. 12.

In Autumn.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Ezekiel 2; Second Lesson, Acts 1 to v. 10. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 3 to v. 22; Second Lesson, 2 Corinthians 5, v. 10.

Friday. Morning: First Lesson, Ezekiel 13 to v. 17; Second Lesson, Acts 4 to v. 13. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 14 to v. 12; Second Lesson, Ephesians 4, v. 7 to v. 17.

Saturday. Morning: First Lesson, Ezekiel 33 to v. 10; Second Lesson, Acts 4, v. 13 to v. 34. Evening: First Lesson, Ezekiel 34 to v. 17; Second Lesson, Hebrews 13, v. 7 to v. 22.

Rogation Days.

Monday. Morning: First Lesson, Deuteronomy 8; Second Lesson, Matthew 6, v. 24. Evening: First Lesson, Deuteronomy 28 to v. 14; Second Lesson, 2 Corinthians 5 to v. 10.

Tuesday. Morning: First Lesson, 1 Kings 8, v. 22 to v. 44; Second Lesson, Luke 11 to v. 14. Evening: First Lesson, Isaiah 64; Second Lesson, James 1 to v. 18.

Wednesday. Morning: First Lesson, Jeremiah 14; Second Lesson, John 6, v. 5 to v. 15. Evening:

First Lesson, Ezekiel 14, v. 12; Second Lesson, James 5.
The report was placed on the Calendar.

DIVISION OF TEXAS.

A message (No. 34) was received from the House of Bishops, announcing the passage by that House of the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, The Diocese of Texas, by constitutional action of the Bishop and Convention, has, for urgent and sufficient reasons, declared its desire to establish its Northern and Western limits on the northern lines of Lampasas, Coryell, MacLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Smith, Gregg, and Marion Counties; and on the Western lines of Matagorda, Wharton, Colorado, Fayette, Bastrop, Travis, Burnett, and Lampasas Counties; and

"Whereas, This Convention is sufficiently assured of the consent of the parishes lying north and west of the aforesaid limits to the proposed limitation to the Diocese.

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the General Convention hereby signifies its consent and agreement to the limitation of the Diocese of Texas, as hereinbefore described, and that so much and no more of the State of Texas as lies within the aforesaid limits is to be regarded and known as the Diocese of Texas."

BOARD OF MISSIONS, 1874-1877.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts, from the Committee appointed to nominate a Board of Missions, reported the following list of names to constitute the Board of Missions for the ensuing three years, viz.:

ALABAMA.—*Clerical*—Rev. John M. Banister, D.D.; Rev. John Fulton, D.D. *Lay*—N. H. R. Dawson; C. H. Stickney.

ALBANY.—*Clerical*—Rev. H. W. Beers, D.D.; Rev. Wm. Payne, D.D.; Rev. J. H. H. Brown, D.D.; Rev. E. N. Potter, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. J. H. Hopkins, D.D.; Rev. Theo. Babcock, D.D.; Rev. J. I. Tucker, D.D.; Rev. J. L. Reese; Rev. F. Harrison; Rev. W. W. Battershall; Rev. John Townsend. *Lay*—James Forsyth; Orlando Meads, LL.D.; W. A. Wood; Lyman Tremain.

ARKANSAS.—*Clerical*—Rev. C. S. Hedges, D.D.; Rev. R. W. Trimble; Rev. C. A. Bruce. *Lay*—John Wassell.

CALIFORNIA.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. Lloyd Breck, D.D.; Rev. B. Akerly, D.D.; Rev. H. D. Lathrop, D.D. *Lay*—Joseph Boston; Edward Stanley; J. Watson Webb.

CENTRAL NEW YORK.—*Clerical*—Rev. A. B. Beach, D.D.; Rev. J. Brainerd, D.D.; Rev. A. B. Goodrich, D.D.; Rev. G. H. McKnight, D.D.; Rev. J. M. Clarke, D.D.; Rev. W. T. Gibson, D.D.; Rev. E. M. Van Deusen, D.D.; Rev. Walter Ayrault, D.D.; Rev. W. A. Hitchcock; Rev. L. R. Brewer; Rev. Hugh L. M. Clarke; Rev. W. D'Orville Doty; Rev. R. G. Quennell. *Lay*—J. W. Clarke; George C. McWhorter; George F. Comstock; H. O. Moss; C. A. Sherman.

CONNECTICUT.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. L. Clark, D.D.; Rev. R. A. Hallam, D.D.; Rev. W. H. Lewis, D.D.; Rev. S. D. Denison, D.D.; Rev. E. E. Beardsley, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. T. R. Pynchon, D.D.; Rev. W. E. Vibbert; Rev. Edwin Harwood, D.D.; Rev. Henry W. Nelson; Rev. George S. Mallory, D.D.; Rev. M. Meier Smith, D.D.; Rev. Walter Mitchell; Rev. L. B. Baldwin; Rev. W. Tatlock; Rev. N. S. Richardson, D.D.; Rev. Samuel H. Giesy, D.D.; Rev. F. Brathwaite; Rev. John Binney. *Lay*—S. H. Huntington; John C. Hollister; John D. Ferguson; Benjamin Stark; E. N. Shelton; J. Godfrey; Andrew S. Kinston; Daniel W. Denison.

DELAWARE.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. B. Clemson, D.D.; Rev. J. Leighton McKim; Rev. W. J. Frost, D.D.; Rev. T. G. Littell. *Lay*—S. M. Curtis; Franklin Fell; Victor Dupont.

EASTON.—*Clerical*—Rev. John Crosdale, D.D.; Rev. Theodore P. Barber; Rev. E. F. Dashill; Rev. John O. Barton; Rev. Robert Wilson. *Lay*—George R. Goldsborough; William S. Walker; I. L. Adkins, M.D.

FLORIDA.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. J. Scott, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. O. P. Thackara. *Lay*—Robert Walker; I. I. Daniels.

GEORGIA.—*Clerical*—Rev. William C. Williams, D.D.; Rev. Samuel Benedict, D.D.; Rev. William H. Clarke. *Lay*—H. H. Steiner; W. W. Montgomery; L. N. Whittle.

ILLINOIS.—*Clerical*—Rev. Clinton Locke, D.D.; Rev. Edward Sullivan, D.D.; Rev. T. N. Morrison; Rev. F. M. Gregg; Rev. S. Corbett, D.D.; Rev. C. S. Abbott; Rev. D. F. Warren, D.D. *Lay*—L. B. Otis; E. H. Sheldon; Emery Cobb; C. T. Bowen.

INDIANA.—*Clerical*—Rev. George J. Magill; Rev. Wm. Wilson; Rev. E. R. Bishop; Rev. A. Mackie. *Lay*—Geo. C. Day; Jno. S. Irwin.

IOWA.—*Clerical*—Rev. Chas. H. Seymour; Rev. R. C. McIlwain; Rev. J. C. Goodhue; Rev. J. Trimble. *Lay*—George Greene; J. L. Daymude; John Hodgdon; James Armstrong; R. T. Bowen.

KANSAS.—*Clerical*—Rev. C. Reynolds, D.D.; Rev. John Bakewell. *Lay*—A. G. Otis; E. M. Bartholow.

KENTUCKY.—*Clerical*—Rev. James Craik, D.D.; Rev. J. N. Norton, D.D.; Rev. J. S. Shipman; Rev. W. M. Pettis; Rev. E. T. Perkins, D.D. *Lay*—S. B. Churchill; J. W. Stevenson; Wm. Cornwall; W. F. Bullock.

LONG ISLAND.—*Clerical*—Rev. C. H. Hall, D.D.; Rev. S. M. Haskins, D.D.; Rev. N. H. Schenck, D.D.; Rev. D. V. M. Johnson, D.D.; Rev. J. A. Paddock, D.D.; Rev. W. A. Snively; Rev. W. H. Moore; Rev. G. W. Smith; Rev. N. Maynard; Rev. E. D. Cooper; Rev. R. T. Pearson; Rev. H. M. Beane, D.D.; Rev. W. S. Chadwell; Rev. R. B. Duane, D.D.; Rev. J. Carpenter Smith, D.D. *Lay*—Geo. A. Jarvis; Alex. V. Blake; H. E. Pierrepont; Wm. G. Low; Jno. T. Walker; Edward Todd; A. W. Benson; W. P. Clyde; S. D. C. Van Bokkelen; Chas. A. Townsend; Chas. R. Marvin; Jno. A. King; Britton Richardson; F. C. Clark; C. L. Twing.

LOUISIANA.—*Clerical*—Rev. W. F. Adams; Rev. W. T. D. Dalzell, D.D.; Rev. J. Philson; Rev. J. F. Girault; Rev. S. S. Harris. *Lay*—P. L. Cox.

MAINE.—*Clerical*—Rev. Samuel Upjohn; Rev. C. S. Leffingwell; Rev. W. H. Washburn; Rev. J. H. Ward; Rev. John Gregson. *Lay*—James Bridge; Robert H. Gardiner; J. H. McMullen; G. E. B. Jackson.

MASSACHUSETTS.—*Clerical*—Rev. A. H. Vinton, D.D.; Rev. Alex. Burgess, D.D.; Rev. C. L. Hutchins; Rev. F. Wharton, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. Percy Browne; Rev. J. I. T. Coolidge, D.D.; Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D.; Rev. W. R. Huntington, D.D.; Rev. Henry Burroughs; Rev. Thos. F. Fales; Rev. Henry F. Allen; Rev. Roger S. Howard, D.D.; Rev. Robt. B. Van Kleeck, D.D. *Lay*—Amos A. Lawrence; Geo. C. Shattuck, M.D.; Joseph Story Fay; Joseph Burnett; Jno. B. Stebbins; Nathan Matthews; E. R. Mudge.

MARYLAND.—*Clerical*—Rev. Geo. Leeds, D.D.; Rev. J. S. B. Hodges, D.D.; Rev. C. W. Rankin; Rev. J. E. Grammer, D.D.; Rev. J. V. Lewis, D.D.; Rev. C. K. Nelson, D.D.; Rev. H. R. Scott; Rev. T. U. Dudley, D.D.; Rev. A. M. Randolph; Rev.

Meyer Lewin, D.D.; Rev. Geo. A. Leakin; Rev. W. T. Watkins; Rev. J. H. Elliot, D.D.; Rev. W. G. Jackson, D.D.; Rev. Thomas A. Starkey, D.D.; Rev. F. James; Rev. A. B. Atkins, D.D. *Lay*—S. G. Wyman; L. Thompson; Bernard Carter; Wm. Woodward; H. Easton; A. H. Dillon, Jr.; Henry M. Bash; Robt. M. Proud.

MICHIGAN.—*Clerical*—Rev. T. C. Pitkin, D.D.; Rev. G. D. Gillespie; Rev. J. T. Magrath; Rev. Geo. Worthington; Rev. Jno. W. Brown; Rev. Saml. Earp; Rev. B. F. Fleetwood; Rev. I. T. Conover; Rev. J. R. Bancroft. *Lay*—P. E. Demill; H. P. Baldwin; C. C. Trowbridge; Henry Hayden; W. R. Shelby; F. A. Gorham; T. P. Sheldon; N. P. Lovridge; R. A. Berry.

MINNESOTA.—*Clerical*—Rev. S. Y. McMasters, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. D. B. Knickerbacker, D.D.; Rev. A. B. Paterson; Rev. E. S. Thomas; Rev. G. W. Watson, D.D. *Lay*—E. T. Wilder; Isaac Atwater; W. B. Jackson; S. C. Bradin.

MISSISSIPPI.—*Clerical*—Rev. W. C. Crane, D.D.; Rev. W. K. Douglas; Rev. Henry Sansom, D.D.; Rev. J. F. Pickett. *Lay*—Thomas E. B. Peques; R. S. Stith; W. T. Balfour.

MISSOURI.—*Clerical*—Rev. M. Schuyler, D.D.; Rev. James Runcie, D.D.; Rev. Samuel Ringold; Rev. E. F. Berkley, D.D. *Lay*—W. F. Ferguson; George H. Gill; John T. Douglas; Silas Bent.

NEBRASKA.—*Clerical*—Rev. A. C. Garrett, D.D.; Rev. J. McNameara, D.D. *Lay*—J. M. Woolworth; J. Metcalf.

NEW JERSEY.—*Clerical*—Rev. R. M. Abercrombie, D.D.; Rev. Alfred Stubbs, D.D.; Rev. Daniel C. Weston, D.D.; Rev. Wm. A. Matson, D.D.; Rev. E. M. Rodman; Rev. S. A. Clark, D.D.; Rev. G. M. Hill, D.D.; Rev. Anthony Schuyler, D.D.; Rev. F. C. Putnam; Rev. J. N. Stansbury; Rev. W. G. Farrington, D.D.; Rev. S. M. Rice, D.D.; Rev. R. N. Merritt; Rev. W. H. Harison, D.D.; Rev. J. F. Garrison; Rev. N. Pettitt; Rev. W. H. Lewis, Jr.; Rev. E. B. Boggs, D.D.; Rev. Horace S. Bishop; Rev. A. R. Walker; Rev. Samuel Hall. *Lay*—J. C. Garthwaite; Charles E. Milnor; Geo. C. Hance; Samuel Tiffany; Henry Meigs; Jas. T. Mackie; A. Mills; J. H. Pugh, M.D.; J. H. Thompson.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. H. Eames, D.D.; Rev. H. A. Coit, D.D.; Rev. Isaac G. Hubbard, D.D.; Rev. Lorenzo Sears; Rev. J. B. Goodrich; Rev. James Haughton. *Lay*—Simeon Ide; Asa P. Cate; Franklin Low.

NEW YORK.—*Clerical*—Rev. B. I. Haight, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. J. Mulchahey, D.D.; Rev. W. F. Morgan, D.D.; Rev. A. B. Beach, D.D.; Rev. R. S. Howland, D.D.; Rev. S. H. Tyng, D.D.; Rev. Samuel Cooke, D.D.; Rev. Thomas Gallaudet, D.D.; Rev. C. E. Swope, D.D.; Rev. J. A. Gallaher; Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D.; Rev. H. Dyer, D.D.; Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D.; Rev. John Cotton Smith, D.D.; Rev. George J. Geer, D.D.; Rev. F. E. Lawrence, D.D.; Rev. C. B. Smith; Rev. G. B. Draper, D.D.; Rev. I. H. Tuttle, D.D.; Rev. W. D. Walker; Rev. T. A. Eaton, D.D.; Rev. George H. Houghton, D.D.; Rev. I. I. Helm, D.D.; Rev. P. K. Cady, D.D.; Rev. Clarence Buel; Rev. J. C. Eccleston; Rev. H. C. Potter, D.D.; Rev. A. T. Twing, D.D.; Rev. C. R. Duffie, D.D.; Rev. J. H. Ryland, D.D.; Rev. C. F. Hoffman; Rev. W. H. D. Grannis; Rev. F. B. Van Kleeck; Rev. S. Hollingsworth, D.D.; Rev. D. F. Banks; Rev. W. H. Benjamin; Rev. R. C. Rogers; Rev. O. Applegate; Rev. H. B. Hitchings; Rev. Joshua Morsell, D.D.; Rev. Hugh Miller Thompson, D.D.; Rev. R. Heber Newton. *Lay*—Lewis Curtiss; T. P. Cummings; J. J. Cisco; U. P. Lee; W. H. Kitchen; George M. Miller; Cyrus Curtiss; George N. Titus; F. S. Watson; N. F. Palmer; Stewart Brown; Hamilton Fish, LL.D.;

George D. Morgan; R. H. Macurdy; J. J. Astor; Jacob Reese; G. J. Barlow; Adam Norrie; W. H. Aspinwall; S. B. Ruggles, LL.D.; W. A. Davies; David J. Ely; Lloyd W. Wells; John W. Mitchell; Theodosius Bartow; J. T. Davies; C. C. Haight; George C. Collins; Cambridge Livingston; W. A. Smith; H. Camman; Elbridge T. Gerry.

NORTH CAROLINA.—*Clerical*—Rev. J. B. Cheshire, D.D.; Rev. Aldert Smedes, D.D.; Rev. A. A. Watson, D.D.; Rev. D. H. Buel. *Lay*—W. H. Battle, LL.D.; Kemp P. Battle; R. H. Smith; A. J. De Rossett, M.D.

OHIO.—*Clerical*—Rev. Louis Barton, D.D.; Rev. W. B. Bodine; Rev. Wm. McLaren; Rev. Thos. B. Wells; Rev. W. W. Farr; Rev. Leighton Coleman; Rev. Erastus Burr, D.D.; Rev. Thos. S. Yocum; Rev. John Ufford, D.D.; Rev. Rufus W. Clark; Rev. H. H. Morrell. *Lay*—W. A. Boardman; I. H. Deveraux; Kent Jarvis; C. Delano; A. H. Moss; Wager Swayne; V. B. Horton; Larz. Anderson; John W. Andrews; W. B. Marfield.

PENNSYLVANIA.—*Clerical*—Rev. Benjamin Watson, D.D.; Rev. E. A. Hoffman, D.D.; Rev. J. A. Harris; Rev. J. W. Claxton, D.D.; Rev. William Rudder, D.D.; Rev. John Bolton; Rev. E. A. Foggo, D.D.; Rev. R. B. Claxton, D.D.; Rev. James Saul, D.D.; Rev. D. S. Miller, D.D.; Rev. T. F. Davies, D.D.; Rev. T. A. Jaggard, D.D.; Rev. Charles D. Cooper; Rev. Theodore S. Rumney, D.D.; Rev. J. H. Eccleston, D.D.; Rev. C. G. Currie; Rev. H. P. Hay, D.D.; Rev. D. C. Millett, D.D.; Rev. E. Y. Buchanan, D.D.; Rev. Charles L. Fisher. *Lay*—Wm. Welsh; Orlando Crease; G. L. Harrison; John D. Taylor; James S. Whitney; G. W. Hunter; Lemuel Coffin.

CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—*Clerical*—Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead; Rev. A. A. Marple; Rev. R. J. Keeling, D.D.; Rev. W. Paret, D.D.; Rev. A. M. Able; Rev. C. E. McIlvaine; Rev. Charles Breck, D.D.; Rev. W. P. Orrick; Rev. W. C. Leverett; Rev. T. C. Caskey; Rev. M. A. Tolman; Rev. H. L. Jones. *Lay*—M. Schall; R. A. Lamberton; Peter Baldy, Jr.; H. S. Goodwin; C. R. Potts; A. Ricketts; J. W. Gurnsey; H. Packer; Robert Packer.

PITTSBURGH.—*Clerical*—Rev. William Preston, D.D.; Rev. John Scarborough, D.D.; Rev. Henry Purdon; Rev. Henry S. Getz; Rev. W. H. Mills; Rev. Richard S. Smith; Rev. H. W. Spaulding, D.D.; Rev. G. C. Rafter. *Lay*—Thomas M. Howe; J. H. Shoenberger; B. B. Vincent; Hill Burgwin; Edward S. Golden; Felix R. Brunot.

RHODE ISLAND.—*Clerical*—Rev. H. Wateman, D.D.; Rev. Isaac P. White, D.D.; Rev. C. A. L. Richards; Rev. Daniel Henshaw; Rev. C. H. Wheeler; Rev. E. H. Porter; Rev. S. H. Webb; Rev. S. D. Seymour; Rev. G. L. Locke. *Lay*—R. H. Ives; C. B. Farnsworth; J. DeW. Perry; John H. Steiness.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—*Clerical*—Rev. A. Toomer Porter; Rev. C. C. Pinckney; Rev. J. D. McCullough; Rev. E. Capers. *Lay*—R. W. Shand; G. C. Memminger; J. B. Palmer.

TENNESSEE.—*Clerical*—Rev. George White, D.D.; Rev. W. C. Gray; Rev. George Beckett. *Lay*—G. R. Fairbank; Jacob Thompson; W. H. Stevens.

TEXAS.—*Clerical*—Rev. B. A. Rogers; Rev. W. R. Richardson; Rev. S. M. Bird; Rev. L. P. Rucker. *Lay*—J. H. Raymond; W. J. Hutchins; George W. Jackson.

VERMONT.—*Clerical*—Rev. A. H. Bailey, D.D.; Rev. Malcolm Douglass, D.D.; Rev. Charles C. Harris; Rev. J. I. Bliss; Rev. C. T. Ogden; Rev. N. F. Putnam. *Lay*—Victor Atwood; Thomas H. Canfield.

VIRGINIA.—*Clerical*.—Rev. J. H. D. Wingfield, D.D.; Rev. W. H. Meade; Rev. G. H. Norton, D.D.; Rev. C. Minnigrode, D.D.; Rev. Joshua Peterkin, D.D.; Rev. J. S. Hanckel; Rev. O. S. Barten, D.D.; Rev. W. L. Hyland; Rev. R. H. McKim; Rev. T. A. Tidball; Rev. J. S. Lindsay; Rev. Theodore M. Carson. *Lay*.—D. N. Walker; D. G. Gordon, M.D.; W. N. Holladay; B. P. Loyal; Hugh W. Sheffey; Tazewell Taylor; N. H. Massie.

WESTERN NEW YORK.—*Clerical*.—Rev. W. Shelton, D.D.; Rev. H. Anstice; Rev. J. Rankine, D.D.; Rev. D. C. Mann; Rev. W. S. Perry, D.D.; Rev. Isaac Foote, D.D.; Rev. J. M. Henderson; Rev. M. Van Renselaer, D.D., LL.D. *Lay*.—G. B. Worthington; S. G. Cornell; D. W. Parshall; T. C. Montgomery; W. H. Walker; W. W. Stacey; George W. Cuyler.

WISCONSIN.—*Clerical*.—Rev. W. B. Ashley, D.D.; Rev. D. Keene, D.D.; Rev. Lewis A. Kemper, D.D.; Rev. Edward P. Wright, D.D.; Rev. James De Koven, D.D.; Rev. A. D. Cole, D.D.; Rev. John Wilkinson. *Lay*.—J. Bodwell Doe; James H. Hoes; Denison Worthington.

COLORADO.—*Clerical*.—Rev. P. V. Finch. *Lay*.—J. H. McMurdy.

DAKOTA.—*Clerical*.—Rev. M. Hoyt, D.D. *Lay*.—J. L. Pennington.

MONTANA.—*Clerical*.—Rev. A. M. Kirby. *Lay*.—Warren Hussey.

NEVADA.—*Clerical*.—Rev. S. P. Kelly. *Lay*.—W. A. M. Van Bokkelen.

NIOBRARA.—*Clerical*.—Rev. S. D. Hinman; Rev. J. W. Cook.

OREGON.—*Clerical*.—Rev. C. R. Bonnell; Rev. L. H. Wells.

On motion of Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts, it was

“Resolved, That the above-named persons be elected members of the Board of Missions, and that notice thereof be sent to the House of Bishops.”

BISHOP OF ILLINOIS.

The Chapel having been cleared of all persons but members of the House, and the Secretary and his assistants, the House proceeded in secret session to consider the resolution reported by the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops, approving the testimonials of Rev. George F. Seymour, D.D., as Bishop-elect of Illinois, and on the adoption thereof the vote is understood to have been as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE.—Forty-one Dioceses represented.

Aye.—Albany, California, Central New York, Easton, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Long Island, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont, Western New York, Wisconsin—19.

Nay.—Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia—10.

Divided.—Alabama, Arkansas, Central Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas—12.

LAY VOTE.—Dioceses represented, 40.

Aye.—Alabama, Albany, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Vermont—13.

Nay.—California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin—18.

Divided.—Central New York, Central Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Easton, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Pittsburgh, Tennessee, Texas—9.

The vote in detail is as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE.

Alabama.—Rev. Dr. Stringfellow and Rev. Dr. Fulton, aye; Rev. Dr. Banister and Rev. Mr. Cobbs, nay.

Albany.—Rev. Dr. Payne, Rev. Dr. Tucker, Rev. Dr. Beers, and Rev. Dr. Brown, aye.

Arkansas.—Rev. Mr. Bruce, aye; Rev. Mr. Trimble, nay.

California.—Rev. Mr. Chetwood, Rev. Mr. Easton, and Rev. Mr. Githens, aye; Rev. Mr. Bird-sall, nay.

Central New York.—Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, Rev. Dr. Ayrault, and Rev. Mr. Hitchcock, aye; Rev. Dr. Wilson, nay.

Central Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Paret and Rev. Dr. Breck, aye; Rev. Mr. Marple and Rev. Mr. Leverett, nay.

Connecticut.—Rev. Dr. Mead, Rev. Dr. Beardsley, Rev. Dr. Clark, and Rev. Mr. Johnson, nay.

Delaware.—Rev. Mr. Spencer, aye; Rev. Mr. Hotchkin, Rev. Mr. Stone, and Rev. Mr. Douglass, nay.

Easton.—Rev. Dr. Stearns, Rev. Dr. Crosdale, and Rev. Dr. Fulton, aye; Rev. Mr. Barber, nay.

Florida.—Rev. Dr. Scott, aye; Rev. Mr. Thackara, Rev. Dr. Camp, and Rev. Mr. Mumford, nay.

Georgia.—Rev. Mr. Rees, Rev. Dr. Williams, and Rev. Dr. Benedict, aye; Rev. Mr. Clarke, nay.

Illinois.—Rev. Dr. Chase, Rev. Dr. Locke, and Rev. Dr. Corbett, aye; Rev. Dr. Sullivan, nay.

Indiana.—Rev. Mr. Roberts, Rev. Mr. Magill, and Rev. Mr. Dunham, aye; Rev. Dr. Wakefield, nay.

Iowa.—Rev. Mr. McIlwain, Rev. Mr. Goodhue, and Rev. Mr. Seymour, aye; Rev. Mr. Trimble, nay.

Kansas.—Rev. Dr. Reynolds, Rev. Mr. Bakewell, Rev. Mr. Dunn, and Rev. Mr. Beatty, nay.

Kentucky.—Rev. Dr. Craik, Rev. Dr. Perkins, Rev. Mr. Shipman, and Rev. Mr. Pettis, nay.

Long Island.—Rev. Dr. Hall, Rev. Dr. Diller, and Rev. Dr. Haskins, aye; Rev. Dr. Schenck, nay.

Louisiana.—Rev. Mr. Harris, aye; Rev. Mr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Girault, and Rev. Dr. Dalzell, nay.

Maine.—Rev. Mr. Leffingwell, Rev. Mr. Upjohn, Rev. Mr. Ward, and Rev. Dr. Pise, aye.

Maryland.—Rev. Dr. Leeds, aye; Rev. Dr. Hut-ton, Rev. Dr. Lewin, and Rev. Dr. Dudley, nay.

Massachusetts.—Rev. Dr. Burgess and Rev. Dr. Lambert, aye; Rev. Dr. Vinton and Rev. Dr. Huntington, nay.

Michigan.—Rev. Mr. Gillespie, Rev. Mr. Brown, Rev. Mr. Earp, and Rev. Mr. Worthington, aye.

Minnesota.—Rev. Dr. Kidney and Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker, aye; Rev. Dr. McMasters, nay.

Mississippi.—Rev. Dr. Crane, Rev. Dr. Sansom, and Rev. Mr. Douglas, aye; Rev. Mr. Marks, nay.

Missouri.—Rev. Dr. Runcie, Rev. Dr. Schuyler, and Rev. Dr. Berkley, aye; Rev. Mr. Jennings, nay.

Nebraska.—Rev. Dr. Garrett and Rev. Mr. Shaw, aye; Rev. Mr. Goodale, and Rev. Mr. Talbot, nay.

New Hampshire.—Rev. Dr. Coit, Rev. Dr. Her-
rick, and Rev. Mr. Haughton, aye; Rev. Dr. Hub-
bard, nay.

New Jersey.—Rev. Dr. Farrington and Rev. Dr.
Abercrombie, aye; Rev. Dr. Clark and Rev. Mr.
Garrison, nay.

New York.—Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Dr. Cady, and
Rev. Dr. Geer, aye; Rev. Dr. Cooke, nay.

North Carolina.—Rev. Dr. Watson and Rev.
Dr. Smedes, aye; Rev. Dr. Buxton, and Rev. Mr.
Huske, nay.

Ohio.—Rev. Mr. Jewett, aye; Rev. Dr. Burr,
Rev. Dr. Boyd, and Rev. Mr. Farr, nay.

Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Davies, aye; Rev. Dr.
Rudder and Rev. Mr. Bolton, nay.

Pittsburgh.—Rev. Dr. Scarborough and Rev. Dr.
Spalding, aye; Rev. Mr. Getz and Rev. Mr. Smith,
nay.

Rhode Island.—Rev. Mr. Seymour and Rev. Mr.
Goodwin, aye; Rev. Mr. Henshaw and Rev. Mr.
Locke, nay.

South Carolina.—Rev. Mr. Porter and Rev. Mr.
McCullough, aye; Rev. Mr. Pinckney and Rev. Dr.
Elliott, nay.

Tennessee.—Rev. Dr. Harrison and Rev. Mr.
Gray, aye; Rev. Dr. Beckett and Rev. Dr. Humes,
nay.

Texas.—Rev. Mr. Rogers and Rev. Mr. Richard-
son, aye; Rev. Mr. Bird and Rev. Mr. Davenport,
nay.

Vermont.—Rev. Dr. Douglass, Rev. Mr. Bliss,
Rev. Mr. Putnam, and Rev. Mr. Atwill, aye.

Virginia.—Rev. Dr. Andrews, Rev. Dr. Norton,
Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, and Rev. Mr. Hancel, nay.

Western New York.—Rev. Dr. Foote, Rev. Dr.
Rankine, and Rev. Mr. Mann, aye; Rev. Dr. Shel-
ton, nay.

Wisconsin.—Rev. Dr. De Koven, Rev. Mr. Haff,
and Rev. Mr. Ten Broeck, aye; Rev. Dr. Adams,
nay.

LAY VOTE.

Alabama.—Messrs. Dawson, Bray, and Clark,
aye.

Albany.—Messrs. Meads, Forsyth, Keese, and
Tremain, aye.

California.—Messrs. Webb and Walsh, nay.

Central New York.—Messrs. Comstock and Mc-
Whorter, aye; Messrs. Chedell and Clarke, nay.

Central Pennsylvania.—Messrs. Coppée and At-
lee, aye; Messrs. Lamberton and Rockwell, nay.

Connecticut.—Messrs. Seymour and Stark, aye;
Messrs. Robertson and Hayden, nay.

Delaware.—Messrs. Fell and Curtis, nay.

Easton.—Messrs. Walker and Goldsborough, aye;
Messrs. Mackall and Adkins, nay.

Florida.—Mr. Walker, aye; Messrs. Daniel, Dot-
terer, and Hamilton, nay.

Georgia.—Mr. Montgomery, aye; Messrs. Jenkins
and Whittle, nay.

Illinois.—Messrs. Otis and Whitehouse, aye.

Indiana.—Mr. Morrison, nay.

Iowa.—Messrs. Bever and Daymude, nay.

Kansas.—Messrs. Farnsworth, Bartholow, Todd,
and Horton, nay.

Kentucky.—Mr. Churchill, aye; Messrs. Steven-
son, Cornwall, and Bullock, nay.

Long Island.—Messrs. Pierrepont, Hunter, King,
and Nichol, nay.

Louisiana.—Mr. Race, aye; Mr. Briscoe, nay.

Maine.—Messrs. Bridge, Ingalls, Jackson, and
Gardiner, aye.

Maryland.—Messrs. Brune and Blanchard, aye;
Mr. Blair, nay.

Massachusetts.—Messrs. Mudge and Shattuck,
aye; Messrs. Bennett and Mason, nay.

Michigan.—Messrs. Trowbridge and Baldwin,
aye; Mr. Peirce, nay.

Minnesota.—Messrs. Wilder, Atwater, and Keese,
nay.

Mississippi.—Messrs. Stith and Bailey, aye; Mr.
Pegues, nay.

Missouri.—Messrs. Bodley and Douglass, aye;
Mr. Simpson, nay.

Nebraska.—Mr. Metcalf, aye.

New Hampshire.—Mr. Low, aye.

New Jersey.—Messrs. Garthwaite, Meigs, and
Mills, aye; Mr. Parker, nay.

New York.—Messrs. Ruggles, Livingston, and Da-
vies, aye.

North Carolina.—Messrs. Battle, De Rossett,
Smith, and Martin, aye.

Ohio.—Messrs. Andrews, Moss, Horton, and Dev-
eraux, nay.

Pennsylvania.—Messrs. Harrison, Welsh, Coffin,
and Hazelhurst, nay.

Pittsburgh.—Messrs. Cass and Burgwin, aye;
Messrs. Shoenberger and Howe, nay.

Rhode Island.—Mr. Stenness, aye; Messrs. Rich-
mond and Hoppin, nay.

South Carolina.—Messrs. McCrady, Lesesne, and
Smith, nay.

Tennessee.—Messrs. Thompson and Fairbanks,
aye; Messrs. Stephens and Cooper, nay.

Texas.—Mr. Augur, aye; Mr. Jackson, nay.

Vermont.—Messrs. Redfield, Smith, and Canfield,
aye.

Virginia.—Messrs. Sheffey, Parker, Massie, and
Taylor, nay.

Western New York.—Mr. Cuyler, aye; Messrs.
Parshall, Smith, and Montgomery, nay.

Wisconsin.—Mr. Clark, nay.

So the resolution reported by the committee was
rejected; and thereupon the House adjourned till
to-morrow at ten o'clock A.M.

FIFTEENTH DAY.

FRIDAY, October 23.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at
ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. J.
S. Hancel, of Virginia. The Creed and Prayers
were said by Rev. William C. Williams, D.D., of
Georgia. The Benediction was pronounced by Rt.
Rev. Joseph C. Talbot, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of
Indiana.

The minutes of the proceedings of the open session
of yesterday were read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the
Committee on Elections, reported that leave of
absence had been granted to Mr. Samuel C. Gray,
lay delegate from the diocese of California, for the
rest of the session.

SUPPORT OF BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom was referred the Memorial from the Diocese of Tennessee, asking for an Amendment of Article V. of the Constitution by omitting the words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese,' respectfully report that the clause proposed to be omitted stands as a limitation upon the right of creating any new Diocese from one, or more than one, of the existing Dioceses of this Church. It is a restriction of recent origin, having been first proposed as a Constitutional Amendment by the General Convention of 1868, and ratified by the Convention of 1871. It has therefore been a part of the Law of the Church for only three years. The Memorial from the Diocese of Tennessee sets forth, as we believe truly, that its necessary operation is to obstruct and delay the proper work of the Church in many parts of the country. There are large Dioceses, especially in the Southern and Southwestern States, coincident in boundary with those States, over the whole of which Episcopal supervision and ministration is practically impossible, and yet where the Church is so feeble, and the poverty of the people so great, as to render the creation of a fund or endowment for the support of a new Episcopate impracticable for the time being. Our construction of the clause in question is that it requires such an endowment sufficient for the support of a Bishop to be actually raised, or at least securely provided for.

"In the judgment of the Committee the policy of this restraint is more than questionable. It seems to us more careful of the dignity of the Episcopate than of the spread of the Church or the salvation of the souls of men. Under a different policy, our Church, from a feeble beginning, has grown with the expansion of our Episcopate until we have forty-one Dioceses, while more are needed, or will soon be needed, to carry forward its beneficent work. We begin to feel already the check imposed upon her growth by a constitutional restraint, which requires an endowment first to be raised when a Church can hardly be said to exist. We shall more nearly conform to the missionary spirit of our Church, more truly follow the law of her development, if we first build her up in the destitute places of our land. Endowment will follow an Episcopate, but cannot precede it, except in regions where the Church communion is already strong, both in numbers and wealth.

"Of the forty-one Dioceses now existing there are very few in which the Episcopate is supported by the income of an adequate fund. If we refer the enquiry to our whole Church, we shall find that the chief basis of support is parish assessment and contribution. If this be so, the question is full of significance : What would now be the condition of the American Church if, in her infancy, the law of her growth had been reversed by a constitutional limitation, like the one now in question ? The support of a new Episcopate is essentially a matter of civil contract between the Bishop-elect and the people who call him to be their Chief Pastor, and we see no sufficient reason for restraining their action by organic law. The elected Bishop, who is chiefly concerned in the question, may have the means of self-support, and if, with the zeal of a Peter or a Paul, a Wilson or a Selwyn, he is ready to carry the message of his Divine Master where it is most needed, ought we to arrest his steps by a law which certainly would have a strange significance in Apostolic days ? Or, he also may be poor and yet willing to share the poverty of those to whom he is sent, relying on them to provide for humble wants, and relying yet more on the sustaining power of Divine Providence.

"The Committee recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolutions :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Fifth Article of the Constitution be amended by striking out the following words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention, until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese.'

"Resolved, That such Amendment be notified to the several Diocesan Conventions, in accordance with the Ninth Article of the Constitution, so that the same may be agreed to or ratified by the next General Convention.

(Signed) CHARLES H. HALL, Chairman."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Allow me to enquire from which House that amendment in 1868 emanated ?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I forget now exactly. The article was rather largely changed. I cannot answer the question exactly.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Perhaps the Secretary can tell us in which House the amendment making it necessary to provide for the Bishop's support before he could be elected, originated. Was it in this House or the House of Bishops ?

The SECRETARY. The House of Bishops.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. So I supposed.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There was a change in another part of the clause at the time.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

DELEGATION TO CANADIAN PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. The Committee on the State of the Church are prepared to make a report, and I call upon my colleague, Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia, to read the report.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. The action of the Committee on the State of the Church is regarding Message No. 20 from the House of Bishops. That message announced the adoption by that House of the following resolutions :

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee to confer with the Joint Committee of the Provincial Synod of Canada be continued until the next General Convention.

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That a deputation, consisting of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three Laymen, be appointed to attend the next Provincial Synod of Canada, with a view to the promotion of the joint interests of the two Churches."

The above resolutions are concurred in, and the nomination of the presbyters and laymen contemplated in the second resolution referred to the Committee.

"The Committee on the State of the Church, to whom was referred Message No. 20 from the House of Bishops, respectfully nominate the Rev. Dr. Craik, of Kentucky; the Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, of Central New York; the Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island; and Governor Fish, of New York; Governor Stevenson, of Kentucky; and Judge Otis, of Illinois, as members on the part of the House of the Joint Delegation to the next Provincial Synod of Canada."

"The Committee on the State of the Church set down also the names of the three highest after those

that were elected: Dr. Shelton, Dr. Vinton, Dr. Leeds, and among the Laity Chief-Justice Waite, Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania, and Governor Baldwin, and request the Chairman of the Committee to fill up any vacancies which may occur in the list of those appointed as Deputies."

I suppose, Mr. President, it will be proper to confirm the action of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will go on the Calendar.

REDUCTION OF PRINTED JOURNAL.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. The members of the House will remember that the Committee on Expenses is also a joint committee to confer with a committee of the House of Bishops as to some mode of reducing the expense of the Journal. Our Journal costs us about \$8,000, and it was thought proper to try to adopt some measure to reduce that great expense. It was found on conferring with the members of the other Committee that several ways and means were proposed, but they needed a good deal of consideration, lest whilst we reduced the expense of the Journal we should diminish its value. This is the resolution agreed upon unanimously by the whole Committee:

"Resolved, That there be appointed a Committee of Publication, composed of a member of the House of Bishops, and of one Clerical and one Lay member of the House of Deputies, together with the Secretaries of both Houses, who shall take order as to the publication of the two journals, and adopt some means by which the expense and size of the journals may be materially reduced.

"Provided, That any scheme which may be adopted by this Committee shall include the furnishing of a copy of the Constitution and Canons of this Church to any clergyman and candidate for orders in the same."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will go on the Calendar.

POINTING OF THE PSALTER.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. At the request of the Chairman, I have a report from the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

"The Committee on the Prayer-Book, to whom was referred the following resolution, report in favor of its adoption:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Standing Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book be authorized and instructed to introduce into all future editions of said Standard Prayer-Book the colon or musical pause in each verse of the Psalter and Canticles, in accordance with the pointing of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England."

The object of this resolution is to afford facilities for chanting the Psalter. It is already the practice in many of our congregations to chant portions of the Psalter. There have been many petitions sent in at different Conventions, asking for a minute pointing of the Psalter. They have been rejected because they were impracticable. There is a great variety of practice in the Church in regard to the cadence, or the more minute divisions of pointing, besides giving instruction in the reading of the Psalter. But we can agree upon a little point, which is a natural division in each verse of the Psalter. The Psalter is constructed, as you know, on the principle of parallelisms, the first clause expressing the sentiment in one form, and the last clause in another form, or in other words. There is, therefore, a natural division, and the colon comes in at the point between the two clauses. It does not obstruct the reading of the Psalter. It is very useful in the chanting of the Psalter in the congregation, enabling members of the congregation to join in the chant, whatever may be the minute point of the ca-

dence, because they know the point where the two parts of the chant divide.

This pointing has always been, from the days of the Reformation, in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. In the very title-page of that Prayer-Book it is explained to be for the purpose of chanting the Psalter, and it is pointed for the purpose of chanting. It was retained even in the proposed book, and I do not know but that our friends who have gone out from us still retain it in the book they have adopted. If they do, they have that advantage over us. I know not how it came to be left out. We cannot ascertain how it came to be left out of our American Prayer-Book. I have asked the Secretary of the House, who certainly ought to know if any man, whether there was any action of the Church on that subject, and he does not know of any. It seems to have been simply the action of a printer: and are we to be deprived in our Church, by the action of the printer, of so great an advantage in the chanting of the Psalter? The object of the pointing is to allow those who desire to chant the Psalter, the greatest facility possible. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will go on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would amend by moving that that be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, or at least that my resolution to that effect be referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book, that the question may come up whether that is a change within the purview of the article. It may be simply the change of a jot or tittle, and if it is so, we had better know it. If we can make the change, even the colon, I am in favor of it. I should like to see it done. I think it is a proper thing; but I would have my resolution referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book, that they may consider that point.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. I think the Committee on the Prayer-Book would certainly report as they have done on that point.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution had better go on the Calendar, if it is to be discussed.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. Very well.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Rev. Dr. PAYNE, of Albany, from the Committee on Unfinished Business, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Unfinished Business respectfully report: That upon examination of the Journal of 1871, they find the following subjects were continued and referred to this Convention for further action:

"1. New rules of order for this House. (See Journal, pp. 108-201.)

"2. Republication of early Journals (p. 195).

"3. Deaconesses (pp. 172, 174, 208).

"Committees and Joint Committees, on other subjects, appointed at the last Convention, may be expected to report as follows:

"1. On Hymnal; 2. On Friendly Intercourse with the Church in Sweden; 3. On Communication with the Russo-Greek Church; 4. On Translations of the Book of Common Prayer in French, in German, in Spanish; 5. On Religious Reformation in Italy; 6. On Christian Education."

DECEASED MEMBERS.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. When I had the honor to present to the House on the twelfth day, on behalf of the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members, their report, distinguished Deputies from North Carolina arose and mentioned the name of Mr. Patterson, Lay Deputy in the Convention of 1871, who had died since the last Convention. This was the first information the Committee had

obtained of his death, although we had made enquiry amongst various deputations. The report was, therefore, informally referred back to the Committee, and they now submit it again, with a portion added to the report relative to these deceased members. I would propose only to read that portion of the report, and then ask the vote of the House on the resolutions appended to the report. The omission referred to was afterwards inserted by the Committee and appears in their report, marked No. 11, as follows :

"XI. In the early part of the year 1874, SAMUEL F. PATTERSON, Lay Deputy in 1871 from the Diocese of North Carolina, departed this life. He was born in the State of Virginia, but removed to North Carolina while he was quite a young man, and passed his long and useful life in the western part of the State. He filled many offices of high responsibility, and was always distinguished for the purity of his character and the integrity of his life. He was a devoted Churchman, and after having attained the age of threescore years and ten, he died universally lamented."

I ask that the House now vote upon the resolutions accompanying the report :

"Resolved, That the report and memorial of the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members be printed as an appendix to the Journal of this House.

"Resolved, That this House mourn the decease from the Church militant of these faithful soldiers and earnest followers of the Lord.

"Resolved, That this House holds their memory in reverence, and desires to place on record its estimate of their worth and service ; and, while blessing God for them, prays for grace to follow their good examples, and with them to become partakers of the heavenly kingdom."

It is the opinion of the Committee, if the House is willing, that the question on these resolutions should be taken by a standing vote.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the report and resolutions from the Committee on Memorials of Deceased Members be put upon their passage now by a standing vote. No objection being made, that course will be adopted. Those members who are in favor of the adoption of the resolution reported will rise.

The whole House arose, and the resolutions were carried unanimously.

RITUAL.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I present a memorial from Governor Dix and three hundred other Laymen, communicants in our Church in the city of New York, requesting that the Convention will not restrain their present liberty by the passage of a Canon restraining or restricting Ritual as it now exists in our Church. It is as follows :

"To the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, assembled in General Convention in the city of New York: The petition of the undersigned Laymen, communicants of said Church, of the city of New York, respectfully shows: That your petitioners having in view the subject of Ritual Observances, now before your honorable body, deprecate any restrictive action being taken therein, for the following reasons: *First*. The passage of a Canon on that subject would not bring peace to our beloved Church, but on the contrary would tend to increase the divisions now so unhappily prevailing in it. It would deprive us, of the Laity, of the kind of services to which we are accustomed and to which we have a right. *Second*. The passage of any Canon affecting the ceremonial observances of the Church would, by implication at least, involve a change in the Prayer-Book. *Third*. Any legislation by your honorable body which would by implication change the mode of Administration of the Sacraments and

other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church,' cannot of right be affected by Canon, but only by an alteration of the Prayer-Book according to the Constitution. *Fourth*. [Your petitioners further represent that with the advancing intelligence of this age and this free country, the true line of progress of this Church is in an increasing liberality and comprehensiveness in all matters not of the essentials of the Faith, rather than in returning to an enforced narrowness of uniformity, which belongs to a past age, and is utterly foreign to the natural tendencies of American Churchmen.] Your petitioners, therefore, earnestly pray that your honorable body will refrain from passing any Canon that shall interfere with or in any way change the liberty now guaranteed to us by the Prayer-Book. And your petitioners will ever pray, etc.

Dated October 13, 1874. (Signed)
EDWARD MATHEWS, B. B. SHERMAN,
JOHN J. CISCO, C. V. B. OSTRANDER,
ELDRIDGE T. GEARY, FRANCIS MAURY,
J. J. ASTOR, CHAS. E. BOGERT,
THOMAS L. OGDEN, W. W. ASTOR,
JOHN A. DIX, STEPHEN C. ROWAN,
A. B. McDONALD, A. J. DREXEL,
S. D. NASH, H. B. CLARK,
And others."

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Canons.

THE HYMNAL.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I beg leave to offer in the name of the only member of the Hymnal Committee who is left on the floor of this House, the report of the Joint Committee on the Hymnal. The only member left on that Committee in this House is Hon. Mr. Pierrepont. I will read the report:

The Joint Committee on the "Hymnal" respectfully report that soon after the adjournment of the last General Convention the Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen, and of Aged, Infirm, and Disabled Clergymen, in whom the copyright of the "Hymnal" was vested, contracted with ten respectable publishing houses for the printing and sale of the book; and a set of electrotype plates, taken from the original standard, was ordered to be placed, on the same date, in the hands of each of these publishers.

The returns of the royalty show that three hundred and twenty-one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one copies of the "Hymnal" have been printed, giving to the Trustees the sum of \$12,650 86 for investment and distribution. So far as we are informed, no complaint has been made of the cost of the book, and it is not believed that the current price has been seriously affected by the royalty returned to the Trustees by the publishers.

The Committee have held several protracted sessions during the past three years, and carefully considered all the important suggestions relating to the "Hymnal" which have come to them, either through private or public channels, while special attention has been directed to the points suggested and recommended in several reports made to Diocesan Conventions. The experience of the last three years has been useful in acquainting the Committee with the preferences of the Church at large in respect to the relative value of various hymns for the purposes of public worship. There is a common instinct which regulates the use of sacred lyrics, and it may not be easy in all cases to see precisely what the element is which gives to a hymn its popularity. Some of those which are in most general use are deficient in everything which belongs to the higher order of poetical composition. The hymns which are best liked by the people at large are often such as are most severely and justly criticised. But there

is *something* which gives them currency, and makes them effective; it may be the rhythm of the words and syllables, the ring of the rhyme, the charm of the music, or some early and sacred association with which they are connected.

The number of absolutely good hymns is comparatively small, and it may not include those which are most commonly sung. There are those who call upon us to winnow the "Hymnal," and cast out all the feeble, commonplace, prosaic, didactic, doctrinal, and descriptive compositions which are alleged to be found here, and then let us have a small collection of the choicest and most classical lyrics that exist in the English tongue. This may be the ideal hymn-book, but it is impracticable.

The experiment has been tested in the Church of England, and the result has been a great multiplication of hymn-books, the people insisting on the use of their favorite hymns, irrespective of any classical standard.

It must be borne in mind that this Committee was created on the principle of representing various views on this subject which are entitled to respect. The members of the Committee were forced to respect this principle; and the result is due to no individual sentiment, but to a desire on the part of all the members to act on the avowed principle of their appointment.

Here it may be added, that if the whole mass of communications which have poured in upon the Committee since the last Convention should be published, it would be seen that to reduce the "Hymnal" to a small compass and make the result acceptable to any large class of persons is simply impossible. There are some who clamor for the retention of all the old metrical psalms and hymns, while others say that too many of them have been retained. Some would reject all the translations of the old Latin hymns, and others would abjure nearly all the hymns that are modern. If we are to wait until a Hymnal is compiled that will satisfy all, we must give up the attempt to frame any book for the common worship of the Church, and throw the whole matter open for every congregation to sing what they please, in which case there would probably be many more discontented spirits than there are now, and a jargon of doctrine introduced utterly inconsistent with the unity of the Church's faith.

Public attention has been directed to the fact that the "Hymnal," as it has been sent out into the Church, does not correspond in every particular with the book as adopted by the Convention. The Committee trust that a simple and candid explanation of all that needs to be explained will in good measure remove both complaint and suspicion.

It was the order of the Convention that the book should be remanded to the Committee for revision, contemplating the removal from it of any remaining literary inaccuracies or defects, and for the preparation of a standard edition. With the view of executing this trust as carefully and thoroughly as possible, it was unanimously deemed advisable to commit the work of clerical correction to a single hand, and to employ upon it a gentleman, a clergyman of the Church, well known as a painstaking student in hymnology. Upon the suggestion that it would reduce the size of the musical editions, as a matter of economy, he was authorized to change in some degree the arrangement and numbering of the hymns.

In conformity with the ordinary practice in our modern hymn-books, and in order to secure uniformity in the "Hymnal," it was determined to place an appropriate expression of Scripture at the head of each hymn where it was not already to be found, to which it was believed no possible objection could be made.

In making the arrangement above referred to, the Committee ask leave to acknowledge, with regret but frankly, two mistakes, neither of which was apprehended at the time, one on their own part, and the other on the part of the gentleman who undertook the work. The Committee were not, for reasons partly personal and partly arising from the distances which separated them, sufficiently explicit, definite, and peremptory in stating the precise nature and limits of what was to be done. If the clerical curator seemed to have stretched in some respects the authority with which he was entrusted, the Committee found that the fault could be remedied, at the time, only at great expense and long delay.

It ought to be observed that the Committee are in no way responsible for alleged variations from the standard edition introduced by publishers through carelessness or intention. The evil can be met only by a zealous vigilance of the public and the press in holding every printer and bookseller to a strict conformity to the standard.

The Committee were further instructed to consider and at their discretion report to the Convention additional hymns "suitable for Sunday-schools and for meetings of lay workers."

In the opinion of the Committee, it is to be desired that the children of the Church should become familiar with the hymns which in after-years they are to sing in the public worship of the sanctuary, and it is thought that the "Hymnal" already contains a sufficient variety of hymns suitable for Sunday-schools and for meetings of lay workers. For those who may desire a wider range of hymns for children, there are to be found a number of excellent compilations, and it is doubtful whether these would be generally superseded by any collection that might be prepared by your Committee.

Respecting the alterations which the Committee made in the "Hymnal," what has publicly transpired will amply justify the Committee in saying a few words. They were made in an undoubting conviction that they were all within the instructions and intentions of the last Convention, and with an unmixed desire to improve the book in every possible and lawful way. Plates having been cast, a question arose, and then for the first time, whether any of the changes were really to be disallowed. Each hymn omitted was carefully examined, and the book was thought to be improved by the omission of nearly all which had thus been left out, either because the hymn omitted was virtually a repetition or because it was intrinsically of little value, and for no other reason; the additions were examined in the same way; and the conclusion reached was not only that there was nothing in any of them which could be objected to on the score of doctrine, but that the book would upon the whole be improved by the introduction of most of these hymns.

The Committee may have mistaken the meaning of the votes in both Houses under which they prosecuted their work. They have certainly acted in good faith and with no apprehension of being blamed. It is a painful surprise to them to find that they are arraigned as exceeding the limits of their duty. It was their belief that what the practical sense of the Church demanded was the best Hymnal they could make with their resources and opportunities. To that end they steadily, and we think we can say patiently, labored. If pecuniary considerations are worth being alluded to, we may be permitted to say that the Committee have relieved the Convention of the payment of \$652 expended in the preparation of the original report, for which the Chairman of the Committee was authorized to draw on the Treasurer of the Convention; they have assumed personally the payment of all the costs incurred in preparing the present report; they have also

cheerfully met all the expense involved in meeting together at least once in every year during the last six years, and other incidental charges, which it is not necessary to specify.

The Committee would further state that in anticipation of the possibility that the Convention may not desire to continue the "Hymnal" indefinitely in its present form, they have prepared and caused to be printed, for the use of the Convention, a revised edition of the book, which they now submit to your inspection. This they have done at their own cost, and mainly through the liberality of a Lay member of the Committee. It has been found that the alterations contained in this revised edition can be made at a cost of about one hundred dollars for each set of plates.

Having done all which they feel they can be expected to do, in the earnest effort to secure a suitable "Hymnal" for the use of the Church in public worship, they respectfully ask to be discharged.

(Signed)

THOMAS M. CLARKE,
G. T. BEDELL,
A. CLEVELAND COXE,
M. A. DEWOLFE HOWE,
F. D. HUNTINGTON,
HENRY E. PIERREPONT.

I move that this report and the message of the House of Bishops on the same subject be made the order of business at two o'clock on Monday.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I offer as a substitute :

"Resolved, That the revised Hymnal reported by the Hymnal Committee, together with all memorials and resolutions on the subject of the Hymnal that have been or may be presented at this session to this House, be referred to a special committee of three clergymen and three laymen to consider and report to this body."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Is that an amendment to my motion? I hope it will not be pressed. We have not time to go to another special committee.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I was going to call attention to the fact that there is already a committee on certain matters touching the Hymnal. Am I mistaken?

The PRESIDENT. That was appointed as a joint committee, and the House of Bishops having refused to join in the Committee, the Committee of course fell.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Then, if it is necessary to appoint any Committee, I suppose a special committee will be necessary. I myself am not in favor of any special committee. I entirely agree with the Delegate from Long Island that our time has been too much consumed already by matters brought before us prior to to-day; but I trust that some definite time will be fixed, and that this whole matter of the Hymnal be made an order for that time. There is a great deal to be said on this matter.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Certainly there is, on both sides. My motion is that it be made the order of business for two o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I suggest that the Committee on Canons will probably report to-day a Canon on Ritual, and they have instructed me to ask the House to fix next Monday at either twelve or two o'clock for taking it up.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Twelve o'clock.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I merely wish to give this notice to Dr. Hall.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. You had better take twelve. This gentleman agrees with me that the Committee on Canons will ask for their Canon on Ritual to be taken up at twelve o'clock on Monday,

and I insist on my resolution that the subject of the Hymnal be the order for two o'clock.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I withdraw my proposition.

Rev. Dr. LOCKE, of Illinois. Can we not pass this now without any talk upon it? ["No," "No."]

The PRESIDENT. I hope the House will understand that it cannot be discussed on its merits. We have to adopt a Hymnal of some sort from somebody. The motion now is to make this report and the resolutions the order of the day for Monday at two o'clock.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I beg to suggest to the Reverend Deputy from Long Island that he might perhaps meet the views of the Committee on Canons and his own also better by making the appointment for two o'clock or twelve o'clock on Tuesday.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Are we to understand, then, that the Committee on Canons are prepared to report, and to ask to make their report the order of the day on Monday at twelve o'clock?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Is it to be supposed that the debate on that matter will be concluded in two hours? Probably not. Therefore I agree with the Deputy from Alabama, that the report on the Hymnal had better be made the order of the day for Tuesday, if so be that we shall be lucky enough to get through the Ritual report by that time. There is a great deal to be said in regard to this matter of the Hymnal. There are several Deputies I believe, one certainly, who have been instructed to utter the voice of their Dioceses against accepting this Hymnal as a finality. There is a very great deal to be said about it. It seems to me a very important matter. I for one, in behalf of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, shall claim the right to be heard.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be far better if we could take up this matter of the Hymnal before we enter upon the vexed question of Ritual, for I am very much afraid that after we get into the Ritual question, if we do go into it, we may not be in any condition to sing hymns. [Laughter.] Therefore I would venture to suggest that it would be very well to take up the Hymnal question, about which, though there is difference of opinion, there is probably no very vast difference of opinion, before we enter on this most difficult question.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I differ with the gentleman from Wisconsin entirely. I think the result of the debate on the Ritual Canon, which will be presented by the Committee on Canons, will cause us to sing hymns, and we shall be prepared to praise God for the unanimity with which this House will adopt the Canon reported by the Committee.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Some one suggests to me that the Bible says: If any man is afflicted, let him sing Psalms. [Laughter.] But this is not a question of Psalms, but Hymns. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I only wish to say that the intimation given by the Clerical Deputy from Pennsylvania, shows that there will be some difference of opinion on the Hymnal, and therefore I would suggest that if all the expressions of opinion from the different Dioceses are to be submitted, as has been proposed, to a special committee, probably such a report will be made as will meet the wishes of all parties, and expedite action upon the Hymnal, because then all will be heard.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Mr. President, why can we not go on with the Hymnal to-day? We are very harmonious, and I am disposed

to hurry up our business. I therefore move that the Hymnal be made the special order at two o'clock to-day.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. First upon the Calendar is the matter pertaining to the Constitutional Amendment, and also the report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, and underlying it all the question of setting off a portion of the territory of Texas. The House of Bishops have already acted on that, and by Message No. 34 sent to us their action for our concurrence. This action has been taken in the House of Bishops for the reason that, if we concur with them, there are certain other things to be done during this session. The territory set off is to be erected into missionary jurisdictions. After that, Bishops are to be nominated to this House. After that, order is to be taken for their consecration. As the matter has been before us now in three General Conventions, covering nine years, and as to-day is the day when it properly comes up for hearing, I hope no order of the day will be allowed to take its place. I would be very glad to know that it could be passed without discussion, as a gentleman suggests, but I understand it will not. I have to move, when I can properly, that the Message of the House of Bishops, No. 34, be concurred in. Will the gentleman withdraw his motion for two o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. No, sir; I think we had better hold on to it. I do not propose to discuss it, but to get the sense of the House. Let us vote on my motion.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I think you are all aware that there will be a discussion which drives over this business that has been before us now for nine years. It puts off the whole matter, perhaps beyond this Convention, and I hope you will not allow it to take precedence of the other.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I second the proposition of the gentleman from Georgia for a special committee.

The PRESIDENT. That has been withdrawn.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I renew it, because I apprehend that, if the question of the Hymnal be opened in this House, it will result in our having no Hymnal at all, and if a special committee is appointed, particularly if it shall be composed of those who object to the present Hymnal, I think by a conference in a day or two we can have such a report as will lead to a unanimous or nearly unanimous conclusion. Otherwise I apprehend the greatest difficulty in coming to any result.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. Which motion is before the House? Three or four motions have been made.

The PRESIDENT. The first question is on the motion of Dr. Hall on behalf of the Joint Committee.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. My proposition was an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Livingston).

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to a point of order. A motion to recommit is not an amendment, but a privileged motion to be made at any time and taken without debate. A motion to recommit a matter to another committee is a privileged question superseding the other, and must be taken without debate.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I understand that a motion to recommit to a committee already existing is privileged matter which cannot be debated, but the question whether we shall make a committee in order to recommit, I think can be debated.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The question has been asked, and considered by the Committee and persons interested in these rules, what they would say to a motion to recommit a

matter to the same Committee. The idea of the gentleman most familiar with the subject is that where a thing has been before a committee and examined, and the House wants it to go to any committee, special or standing, it must be so ordered without debate.

The PRESIDENT. The rule is very distinct that a motion to recommit any subject that has been before a committee must be decided without debate.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. To recommit to that Committee, not to another committee. Is that not it?

The PRESIDENT. It does not say anything about that.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. Certainly a fair construction of the rule of order requires the Chair to hold that a motion to recommit is to send back to the same Committee. I apprehend that no parliamentarian ever heard of recommitting a thing to a different Committee. That is new matter. There is no *re* about it. The *re* is to send it back to the same Committee. I think there can be no two opinions on that point among parliamentarians.

Mr. COPEEE, of Central Pennsylvania. The rule reads thus:

"There shall be no debate upon a resolution which proposes to refer any matter to a committee."

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. If this matter be not debatable, I would request the Clerical Deputy from Virginia to withdraw his motion for a single moment.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I think it is debatable.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. The Chair has decided otherwise.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I rise to a point of order, that the subject-matter of the Hymnal cannot be debated on this motion; but the expediency of the motion can be debated.

The PRESIDENT. There is no resolution before the House, as I understand, which proposes to refer this matter to the same Committee. It is a motion to refer to a special committee, and therefore debatable.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Then I wish to state in a few words my object. If gentlemen will carefully read over the resolution reported here from the Upper House, I think it will be found that that resolution, and action under it, have a certain character of finality. I wish the Secretary to read the resolution of the House of Bishops in their message on that subject.

The Secretary read Message No. 32 from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I simply desire the Convention in this matter to act advisedly. It seems to me that the resolution reported from the Upper House gives to the Hymnal presented to us through their liberality a certain character of finality. I think that if we vote in the affirmative on the resolution reported from the Upper House, it will have the effect of an utterance by this body of an absolute and final approval of the Hymnal submitted. I know perfectly well that it is within the power of the General Convention at any time to take up the whole matter and review it; but I know also that when any action on the part of the General Convention has received this quality of finality, there is a certain conservative reluctance to touch it again. I know, further, that if any attempt at some future time should be made to review the Hymnal, the action of this body will be pleaded as a bar in the way. I do not believe, moreover, that this body can reach a clear, well-understood determination in this matter without considering certain things con-

nected with the history of the production of this Hymnal.

It will be observed that we have two resolutions before us, one touching the Hymnal itself, concerning which a great deal is to be said, and one touching the action of the Committee. That second resolution involves two distinct points. In so far as it is a resolution of thanks to the Committee for their very great trouble,—indeed, I do not think any terms can be too superlative to express that trouble,—and their great liberality, I heartily agree to it. I know individual members of that Committee who are out of pocket several hundred dollars by this work. I for one, and I suppose this whole Convention, will vote a most hearty affirmative. But there is a clause that we thank the Committee for having received suggestions and criticisms, and carefully considered them. Now, sir, that is a very suspicious sentence. Is it not a most extraordinary thing that we should thank a committee of this body for having received our criticisms and suggestions? Is it so great a favor that they have listened to us? There have been objections to the consideration of suggestions.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for entering upon the Calendar has arrived.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I rise to make a suggestion which I think will facilitate the labors of this Convention. I move that the Secretary be directed to have the Calendar printed. I do not know what is on the Calendar, and nobody else can know as at present advised. I think the Convention will find that it will lessen its labors greatly to have the Calendar printed, and I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT. Will the Convention entertain the motion for printing the Calendar?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I ask if it is not printed in THE DAILY CHURCHMAN, and if so, will not that supply the information?

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. It never has been printed that I know of. It ought to be printed daily, and furnished to each member of the Convention. It costs little, and will add greatly to the promptness of the discharge of business.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I rise to suggest to the gentleman whether it is not better to wait until after to-morrow. I believe to-morrow is the last day when new matter can be introduced. The Calendar will be more useful if printed after to-morrow.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask whether if we come to the order of the day we should not do it at once, and if not, whether anything can take the place of my resolution. I have offered a resolution. A gentleman comes in now with a different matter to cut me off. I give way to the order of the day, but not to that.

The PRESIDENT. I do not see that the motion just made can be entertained without the general consent of the House.

DIocese BECOMING A MISSIONARY JURISDICTION.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Then I move that Message No. 34 from the House of Bishops be taken up, and then I shall move that it be concurred in.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I move that that be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I desire to say upon the motion to refer to the Committee on Constitution, that this matter has been before the House now for three sessions. It has been referred to the Committee on Constitution, in substance, in these messages, and it has been before them. We have their report. We have the action of the House of Bishops, and now I believe I can convince this

House, if I am allowed to do so, as I suppose I may be, that there should be immediate action, and that here is the place and now is the time to decide this matter, once and for ever.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Is the motion to refer to a committee debatable?

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas that if he would not interfere with Mr. Livingston's motion to make the Hymnal the order of the day at two o'clock, it is very probable that the matter of Texas can be settled in the meantime. It is one of the clearest cases that can come before us. I do not see what occasion it can give for any large discussion in this House, and as the case is an urgent one requiring prompt attention in order to subsequent action.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT. If you postpone the point of order now, we shall get on faster.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I make my point of order. The question is to refer to a committee. The gentleman is discussing the merits of the question itself.

The PRESIDENT. Which he has the right to do.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Touching the point of order, I believe the Chair will agree that Mr. Livingston's motion came before that of the gentleman from Virginia, and it is in connection with that motion and the business of the gentleman from Texas that I would speak. I would submit to him, therefore, whether he feels bound to interfere with the motion to make the Hymnal the order of the day for two o'clock to-day, and, meanwhile, get an opportunity to bring up the Texas matter, and I think the House will put its seal upon it almost immediately.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. It seems to me the matter of Texas may be decided, and then the other motion without interruption.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Let the Hymnal go on the Calendar.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. If there were to be no discussion I would not say a word, but I am aware that there is to be a strong effort made to send this back to the Committee, and there to be considered for I do not know how long, and the effect will be to throw it beyond the action of this Convention at this term, and therefore I beg to state the case of the Diocese of Texas.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I call the attention of the Chair to the twelfth rule. I raise the question of order, whether upon a question to commit or to recommit there can be debate.

The PRESIDENT. I have decided that point of order. This is not a resolution.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Does the Chair think a motion to recommit and a resolution to recommit are different things?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. It is the first time it was ever so decided, I am sure.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. With the permission of the Clerical Deputy from Texas—

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I cannot allow it to go out to the world that we stumble on mere insignificant things, and that a motion in writing to commit and calling it a resolution changes this order. While I have great respect for the Chair, I appeal from that decision, and say that the true construction of this rule is that no motion or resolution to commit is debatable.

The PRESIDENT. An appeal is made from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. On the question of order I wish to make a suggestion. All this matter was supposed to be settled

when the question was raised before. The idea of those who adopted the rule—at least my idea when we adopted the rule—was that a resolution to refer any matter to a committee should not be debatable. When any matter came before the House for action, and the mover wished the action of the House, and somebody else moved to commit it, that was debatable. When a man rose in his place, and for the first time introduced a matter to the House in the form of a resolution to refer it and did not ask anything but a reference, it is not debatable. Whether you call it a motion or resolution, I repeat, when a matter is presented to the House, and the person who presents it asks of the House to refer it either by motion or resolution, when he does not ask immediate action, but simply asks that it be referred to the Committee, the idea is that it shall not be debatable; but when a member brings a matter for action before the House and it is called up on the Calendar, and somebody moves to take it away from us, and then and there to commit it, that is debatable under the first rule, which says that all these privileged questions are debatable, except a motion to adjourn and a motion to lay on the table, leaving the motion to commit debatable. This very rule, by saying that a motion to recommit is not debatable, implies that a motion to commit a matter under the consideration of the House, which the mover does not ask to be referred, may be debated. The distinction is very marked; and there is a reason for it. We must look at the reason and not at technicalities. When I rise in my place and ask the House to permit me to refer to a committee a particular subject, the rule says it shall not be debated. When I rise in my place here and present a resolution or a Canon or anything else, and ask the House to adopt it, and they enter into the discussion of it, and somebody moves to take it from the consideration of the House and commit it, that motion is debatable. That is all that the rule is, and the Chair so held before, and such was the view, I think, of those familiar with the object, the reason, and the good sense of the rule.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I agree fully with the gentleman from Western New York in the view that he has taken; and so much impressed have I been with the importance of an amendment to that rule to cover the case which now is presented to us, that the Calendar of the Secretary will show that several days ago I gave notice of an amendment to that rule, providing that all messages from the House of Bishops communicating any legislative action on their part should be referred to the appropriate committee without debate. It was to supply just the very omission which now presents itself to the House. I think that all communications from the House of Bishops should be referred, and, of course, that there should be no two debates upon them—one upon the question of reference, and one when the report of the committee should come in.

Rev. M. ROGERS, of Texas. Does not the gentleman agree with me that under the present rule I am entitled to go on?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is not the question now before the House.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the appeal.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. A motion to amend this rule in conformity with the statement I made was considered by the gentlemen who drew up the rule, and by the Chair, and it was settled that the Chair would rule in accordance with the statement I have just made, and it would be just as good as an amendment of the rule. And the Chair so rules, as I

understand, that when a matter is introduced originally by the mover for the action of the House, it cannot be committed on somebody's motion without debate; but where the original mover of a proposition asks that it be referred only and not to be acted on by the House, it is not debatable. The Chair said he did so understand the rule and would so hold; and if he does, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his appeal, for it is altogether the most satisfactory rule.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I have no feeling on this subject, but I suggest, I think without the fear of contradiction, to all who are conversant with parliamentary law, that when a message comes from one House to another it goes, as a matter of course, without debate, to some committee, unless it be made a special order, or by motion laid upon the table; and the reason of the rule is apparent. I understood the Chair to decide that if I had moved to resolve to do this, it could not have been debated, and because I moved to do it, it was debatable. I am sure the Chair upon reflection will see that that ruling cannot be sustained.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair very concisely stated the determination to which he had come, not giving any reason for it. The reason has been stated by the gentleman from Western New York upon the appeal. It will be recollected that the Chair decided the case, put it out of his own jurisdiction, and it is before the House. A motion to commit any matter which is already before the House waiting its action, the Chair has decided is debatable because it brings up the whole merits of the case. It brings up the whole point whether the House is prepared to go on with the consideration of a subject upon which it has already entered, or to put it out of its own power, and send it to a committee. That includes, as the gentleman from Texas states in this case, the fate of a measure, and therefore the Chair decided as he has done. The question is on the appeal.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I beg leave respectfully to differ with the Chair upon what he stated was his ground. This House is witness of what the Chair said, and the Chair did say emphatically, that if I had moved a resolution—

The PRESIDENT. No, no, the Chair did not state any such nonsense as that.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I appeal from the recollection of the Chair to the House, but that is immaterial. I want now to hear from the Chair upon this point. When a message comes from the House of Bishops, and no disposition and order has been taken, do I understand the Chair to say that a motion to refer that message is debatable?

The PRESIDENT. Messages that come—

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I rise to a point of order, the first one I ever raised in my life. When this case was called first on the Calendar, Mr. Rogers had a right to the floor, and no man had a right to make any motion without his giving way.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The gentleman will make his point of order when he gets the floor. I am on a question of order. I am perfectly willing to have a lecture from the Deputy from North Carolina on the question of order; but he must get the floor first to make it, and I am now on the floor upon a point of order. I want to hear the ruling of the Chair as to what the rule of the House is upon a message from the House of Bishops, whether a motion to refer it is debatable.

The PRESIDENT. That question is not before us. That is the ruling of the Chair upon that point.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I did move to refer it to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. This matter of the message of the House of Bishops has been placed on the Cal-

endar, and comes up by an order of the House, together with sundry other matters, at twelve o'clock to-day. The question is upon the appeal.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President, As everything involved in this question is to be considered, and legitimately considered, on this motion to refer, I will ask the Secretary to read the memorial of the Bishop and Council of the Diocese of Texas, as it is a part of the record.

The Secretary read as follows :

"MEMORIAL OF THE BISHOP AND COUNCIL OF THE
DIOCESE OF TEXAS.

"To the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America :

"The undersigned, the Bishop of the Diocese of Texas and the Council of said Diocese, by its duly authorized representatives in the premises, as appears by a certified copy of the proceedings of the last annual Council, hereunto attached, respectfully represent and give this Convention to be informed "that the territory of said Diocese of Texas is too large for due episcopal supervision by the Bishop of said Diocese, and do pray the General Convention to set off from said Diocese all that portion of its present territory lying westerly and southerly of the counties of Matagorda, Wharton, Colorado, Fayette, Bastrop, Travis, Burnet, and Lampasas, and northerly and westerly of the counties of Lampasas, Coryell, McLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Smith, Gregg, and Marion ; and that the said territory so cut off may thereafterwards constitute such missionary jurisdictions as the House of Bishops may determine.

"And for further information relative hereto, the Bishop and Council of said Diocese do give the General Convention further to be informed that said Diocese is now found to contain about 270,000 square miles of territory, of which about 200,000 are embraced in 167 organized counties, and the balance in territory not yet organized, but rapidly filling up with inhabitants and soon to be largely organized into thriving counties, towns, and cities ; that the number of inhabitants of the Diocese is now about 1,200,000, exclusive of Indians, of which, should this petition be granted, and the territory so set off be constituted into two Missionary Jurisdictions, according to the further prayer of your petitioners to the House of Bishops, over 500,000 would be residents of said Diocese as then limited ; over 400,000 would be residents of the Northern, and over 200,000 of the Western Missionary Jurisdictions.

"Of the 167 counties, 57 would be within the then Diocese, 55 within the Northern, and 55 within the Western Missionary Jurisdictions—the tract of unorganized territory being divided between said Missionary Jurisdictions.

"There are now within the Diocese 39 parishes, 34 missions, and 32 presbyters and deacons. Of these, 26 parishes, 15 missions, and 20 presbyters and deacons would be left within the Diocese ; 4 parishes, 9 missions, and 5 presbyters and deacons would be within the Northern, and 9 parishes, 9 missions, and 9 presbyters and deacons within the Western Missionary Jurisdictions.

"The railroads are few and far apart, accommodating but widely-scattered threads of country. The means of locomotion of the greater portion of the country are still the stage-coach, the private carriage, and the saddle.

"There are great tracts of inhabited country waiting for the blessings of the Church, where its services were never heard and the foot of its Bishop

has never gone, simply because, being human, he is confined to the limits of human possibility.

"Six years ago, by the unanimous voice of its Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, the Diocese of Texas asked of the General Convention such legislation as should give relief from these overwhelming burdens. The General Convention then responded by a radical change of the organic law of the Church, but from this change the Diocese found itself utterly unable to derive any benefit. Still it could not bring itself within its terms.

"Three years ago, by the unanimous voice of Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, it *again* petitioned the General Convention for relief, and at that time indicated substantially the same method as now herein prayed for.

"Again the General Convention responded by initiating the proposed amendment to the Constitution now pending before this Convention (allowing portions of a Diocese too large for the due supervision of its Bishop to be set off into missionary jurisdiction).

"One year ago, at the annual session of the Council of the Diocese, when this proposition for the amendment of the Constitution came before it, the Diocese not only gave its consent, but again, by unanimous voice, passed a resolution relating thereto, in words following, viz. :

"Resolved, That the Deputies from this Diocese to the next General Convention are instructed to *urge* the passage of the said Constitutional Amendment by that body, and that certified copies of this resolution be furnished by the Secretary to each of said Deputies before the session of said General Convention."

"And now again, after six years of consideration, and for the same reasons as heretofore, though growing constantly more and more important, the said Diocese again lays its condition before the General Convention, and prays for relief ; and not that it may be allowed to abandon its legitimate responsibility or shirk its work, but because here are broad and fertile fields abundantly ready for the seed, or ripe for the harvest of the Church, which it *can* neither plant, gather, nor abandon.

"ALEX. GREGG,

Bishop of Texas.

BENJ. A. ROGERS,
W. R. RICHARDSON,
S. D. DAVENPORT,
S. M. BIRD,

Clerical Deputies.

GEORGE W. JACKSON,

Lay Deputy.

"DIOCESE OF TEXAS.

"The following report, with accompanying resolutions, was adopted at the twenty-fifth annual Council of the Diocese of Texas, held in Jefferson, May 28, A.D. 1874—to wit :

"[Copy of Record.]

"Report of the Special Committee on the Reduction of the Diocese and Increased Episcopal Supervision :

"The Committee to whom was referred so much of the Bishop's address as relates to increased Episcopal supervision for and a reduction of the territory of the Diocese of Texas, report that, after a careful examination thereof, they fully coincide with his opinion therein expressed. We believe that the interests of the Church do imperatively demand such legislation as shall give to the Church far more Episcopal supervision than it is possible for any one Bishop to render.

"Our territory is about 250,000 square miles, with 165 counties. Our railroads accommodate but mere far-scattered threads of country. Our population is

some eleven or twelve hundred thousand souls, and to us it is clear that our obligations as a Church are utterly beyond our ability as a Diocese. The services of our Church should be carried to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of villages, hamlets, and neighborhoods within our borders where now they are never heard.

"Our records show that to divide our Diocese into two or more is canonically impossible. To avail ourselves of the services of an Assistant Bishop, and support him, is equally impossible, and, if that could be done, is not desirable.

"To meet these urgent wants, our Bishop recommends that the next General Convention be petitioned by this Diocese to set off all that portion of this Diocesan Territory that lies westerly and northerly of the following described lines, metes, and bounds—to wit: Beginning on Matagorda Bay, at the southwesterly corner of Matagorda County, thence northwesterly, on the westerly lines of the Counties of Matagorda, Wharton, Colorado, Fayette, Bastrop, and Travis, and Burnet to its point of contact with the Colorado River; thence up the middle of said river to the northwesterly corner of Lampasas County, and thence northeasterly along the northerly lines of Lampasas, Coryell, McLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Smith, Rusk, Gregg, Harrison, and Marion Counties, to the easterly boundary line of the State; and thence following said easterly boundary line of the State of Texas southerly to the Gulf of Mexico, and thence following the southerly boundary line of said State, along said Gulf, westerly to the place of beginning on the southwesterly corner of Matagorda County; and that the territory lying outside the aforesaid line be taken under the care of the General Church; and that the House of Bishops be further petitioned to erect the same into missionary jurisdictions and to elect Missionary Bishops therefor.

"Your Committee therefore recommend the passage of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Bishop of the Diocese be requested, and our deputation to the next General Convention be instructed, to petition that body in the premises, setting forth that the territory of the Diocese is too large for the one episcopal supervision of the Bishop of this Diocese, and praying that said Convention will set off all that portion of the territory of this Diocese outside the line above described, the metes and bounds as above set out.

"Resolved, That the Bishop and said deputation are hereby empowered, in behalf and in the name of this Diocese, to do any and every thing necessary to carry out the foregoing purposes.

"A true copy from the minutes of the Council.

"Attest: W. R. RICHARDSON,
"Secretary."

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I now ask the Secretary to turn to the questions put to the Constitutional Amendment Committee, and read the report thereon.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I suggest that the whole report need not be read. We have it printed in our hands.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I will read a portion of it: "The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred a resolution directing them to consider and report to this Convention whether any constitutional amendment is necessary to empower the General Convention of this Church to set off a missionary territory from the bounds of a Diocese, at the request of said Diocese, duly made known, have given full consideration to the subject, and respectfully report."

The first part of the report takes up the interest of

the Board of Missions in this subject, and here is the opinion:

"The Committee are of opinion, therefore, that it does not require an amendment of the Constitution to empower the General Convention, through the agency of the Board of Missions, and by the processes marked out in the Canons and in the Constitution of the Society, which may be considered to be the Constitution of the Board of Missions, with the consent of the Bishop and Conventions of any organized Diocese, to occupy or set apart any portion of such Diocese as missionary ground. This would be a full response to the terms of the resolution referred to the Committee; but it is proper to point out that this does not recognize the right of the Convention, even with the consent or at the request of the Bishop and Convention of any Diocese, permanently to dismember a Diocese. Your Committee are induced to add this because it has come to their knowledge that perhaps something like this has very innocently been done, but without any committal of the Convention to its lawfulness."

There have been certain Dioceses organized heretofore, of which I will speak by-and-by. Now, as bearing on the report of this Committee, I beg to state still further that the proposition has been brought before the Board of Missions, from whom the material funds come for the support of the Episcopate in the portion of the territory to be set off, and that Board recommend this action:

"The undersigned, the Committee appointed by the Board of Missions by the second resolution, beg leave to lay before the House of Deputies the following action of the Board at a meeting held in St. Ann's Church, in this city, on Thursday, October 22:

"Resolved, That in view of all the facts set forth in the memorial of the Diocese of Texas, and the pressing necessity of the said Diocese for the relief therein asked, this Board of Missions do recommend the granting of the prayer of said memorial, and that the House of Bishops do, at its present session, erect two missionary districts, and nominate to the House of Deputies two missionary Bishops therefor, according to the terms of said petition.

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the Chair to communicate the foregoing resolutions to both Houses of the General Convention."

The Right Rev. Bishops Doane, Young, and Tuttle were appointed such committee, and here is the proper attestation.

Six years ago the Diocese of Texas came into General Convention, and for the first time made known its condition. For the first time were brought to the eye of the Church the facts that the map now before you shows, and the other facts relating to the working thereof. At that time the Constitution of the Church required that there should be some forty parishes left in a Diocese when a portion was set off; that there should be fifteen self-supporting in the new Diocese to be formed. The view taken at that time was that there must be some legislation that should allow the division of the Diocese of Texas into two or more Dioceses; and under the pressure of the extreme necessity of the Diocese, six years ago was initiated the constitutional change that allows a division without the slightest reference to the parishes being self-supporting, a division that shall leave but twelve parishes in the old and but six in the new Diocese.

But there was at that time a provision which annulled, as far as we were concerned, the whole change. It was, that before a Diocese could be divided there should be secured the support of the Bishop, construed to mean a fund or a subscription for a fund, the interest of which shall support the

Bishop for all time to come. The constitutional measure was carried three years after, but we returned to Texas again bound hand and foot.

There were two reasons why we could not divide. The first was, that no legitimate division could be made leaving six ministers on the side of the new Diocese. The other was that there was no way under Heaven that we could raise an extra dollar to support the Episcopate in the new Diocese. We had found it hard in the extreme to support the one Bishop that we had. - So it fell through. Three years ago under the unanimous instructions of our Diocese we came here and asked substantially what we ask now, and we found that the Constitution had been created in a day when it was never dreamed that there was to be such an outgrowth of the Church, and such enormous fields into which she was to push her way, that it never mentioned from beginning to end the question of Missionary Jurisdictions or Missionary Bishops. We found that the Church, finding herself at last to do something beside divide Dioceses into new Dioceses, without a single word in the Constitution, had embraced and taken up the idea that she was free to act for herself, that wherever the work of God called for our ministry to go, and wherever that ministry must be led by the Episcopate, she acted on the ground that she was of age, not having limited herself by word or deed, and not having mentioned it in any way, she by Canon by the action of the General Convention supplied the means. Missionary jurisdictions were erected all through the West and Missionary Bishops were nominated to us, and confirmed all through the West, without ever having it for one moment sprung upon this floor that the Church was not entitled to send her Bishops wherever souls were perishing and men were waiting to receive their words.

Acting upon this we came here and asked another thing, that, with a territory like ours, with a pressure beyond all conception, with hundreds of thousands of men, white men, standing year after year and never hearing the voice of the Church, with two hundred thousand miles into which the foot of the Bishop has never gone, and can never go, simply because he is human, and because in the seven months when he can ride in the stage-coach by night, in private conveyance by day, stopping only a day or two in this parish and a day or two in that, every minute of his time is occupied in visiting the few parishes and missions, about seventy, that are scattered throughout the broad eastern portion of our State, because this is the fact, and the other parts of the territory are never reached. We came and asked you to set off, to do as to that territory what you had done as to Bishops, to set off a portion of that diocese, not against its consent, but with its unanimous voice, no voice having ever been heard against it anywhere, with the direct approval and urging of the Bishop at home and here, we the Deputies here fully authorized to represent the Diocese asking to surrender what it could never touch. We asked you to take it, the Church at large to resume into its broad arms this enormous territory and give it the Church of God. We were met with the objection that there was no Constitution for it. I agree there was no necessity for the Constitution for it. The idea that such a thing should be needed never came to the knowledge of the framers of the Constitution, and they neither gave it nor refused it. Then we were free. But the few men who then urged the necessity of a constitutional amendment, so far prevailed in Committee that the representatives of Texas thought it best—and California was with us hand in hand—to withdraw their claims at that time, and

allow the matter to go for three years. We had another express provision carried through both Houses to meet the temporary want. That provision was by Canon that wherever a Diocese was territorially so large that the Bishop could not perform Episcopal functions, then the Diocese might have an Assistant Bishop. We returned with that after three years, but how were we to have an Assistant Bishop? Again the funds necessary to support him were an absolute impossibility to acquire, and we have remained three years. The constitutional provision that was then by some deemed necessary was initiated, but it fell through by a mere accident in the House of Bishops. They failed by forgetfulness to carry through their House the initiation of the constitutional provision deemed only necessary by a few. Our Secretary going into the records of the past, taking what had been acted on in this Convention from time immemorial, found the law to be that there was no necessity for a constitutional provision, or that, in case the Bishops failed to act, then it became the law, and he sent it down to the Dioceses. But we return here. The question is sent before the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and they report that the constitutional amendment has failed. Now we set before that Committee the question whether any constitutional amendment is necessary, and they have replied in the language I have read you:

"The Committee are of opinion, therefore, that it does not require an amendment to the Constitution to empower the General Convention, through the agency of the Board of Missions and by the processes marked out in the Canons, and in the Constitution of the Society which may be considered to be the Constitution of the Board of Missions, with the consent of the Bishop, and Conventions of any organized Diocese, to occupy or set apart any portion of such Diocese as missionary ground."

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. What else do they say?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I have read it once, but will read it again if you desire.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Read the next paragraph.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. "But it is proper to point out that this does not recognize the right of the Convention, even with the consent or at the request of the Bishop and Convention of any Diocese, permanently to dismember a Diocese." What does that mean? Once Virginia held Kentucky and other portions of the Union, and when her territory was cut down she allowed Dioceses to be formed without following the ordinary rules prescribed by the Constitution. That is a permanent dismemberment; it is taking away her territory; it is the organization of a new Diocese. It comes in here and disturbs the unity of representation. That perhaps might not be done; but here is a temporary matter; it is a setting off of a missionary jurisdiction; it gives no Deputies here to speak; it only temporarily puts this territory in the hands of the Church at large, and there will be no such dismemberment as affects this Convention until in the process of time it is effected by the constitutional methods of erecting new Dioceses. We do not propose to erect a new Diocese. In time they will be eligible as new Dioceses, and then come in under the Constitution; but now they are not. It is a temporary affair, a mere setting off of work, rather than a setting off of territory. It is a giving up of what we cannot touch, that the work may be accomplished.

Mr. MARTIN, of North Carolina. Three Bishops in the Diocese of Texas—is that to be allowed?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. No; the jurisdictions are given off, two to Missionary Bishops; but the gentleman should remember that it is a jur-

isdiction of work, and not a foot of ground that anybody claims to own. The Church does not do that. She will build no barracks there; she will erect no forts; she will not turn her guns against the Church. She claims to do nothing of that kind, but she gives up her work. And now to come back—

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Who will have jurisdiction of the Diocese?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I will answer all these questions when I am through, if I am required to do so.

Now as to the necessity. The Diocese of Texas contains 268,684 square miles. It has 167 counties; it is four times larger than all New England; it is six times larger than all New York; it is twenty-eight times larger than all New Hampshire; it is 265 times larger than Rhode Island; it is three times larger than all Great Britain; it is seven times larger than both Belgium and Holland; it is seventeen times larger than Switzerland; and it is larger than either France or Austria; and that is contained within the single jurisdiction of one Bishop. There are to-day twenty-five Bishops in the eastern territory of the United States doing Episcopal work over the same amount of territory that one Bishop in Texas is attempting to do. If I go into my brother's Church at Jefferson, and out at El Paso, where two churches are, I shall have travelled a thousand miles straight. We have in all the State seventy-three parishes and missions. Suppose you allow to each of these seventy-three places a Church influence affecting and controlling thirty-six square miles. I first said nine in making my calculation. I said there is no minister in this church whose influence is over nine square miles, but when I came to put it down upon the map it shocked me, and I was so shocked that I multiplied it by four. Now you will allow thirty-six square miles as influenced by the church in each of these parishes and missions, and there is but one single mile in every one hundred miles of territory affected by the Church.

Gentlemen, you see that map which is back of the Chair. The State of Texas covers the whole of the colored portion, all that you see excepting a little portion down in the corner which is detached. Now, allow thirty-six square miles to be church ground, to every one of these parishes and every mission, and that upper red square in the corner represents exactly the amount of territory that we cover by the Church. In that jurisdiction intended to be set off in the North there are 100,000 square miles. You see here the old Dioceses as intended to be reserved (illustrating). Here is the contracted Diocese. Here is the western jurisdiction, and here is the northern jurisdiction (illustrating on the map). As I cannot go over it all, I will only take one, stating first that if divided the contracted Diocese will contain 500,000 inhabitants, with some 60,000 square miles; the western jurisdiction will contain 250,000 inhabitants with over 100,000 square miles; the northern jurisdiction will contain about 450,000 inhabitants with 100,000 square miles. In that northern jurisdiction are 57 organized counties, with four hundred and odd thousand inhabitants, with only five ministers of the Church. When you divide the white inhabitants of that region among those ministers, you have 80,000 souls under the spiritual oversight of a single minister, and he ordinarily a deacon. You appropriate to each one of those men twenty square miles and more, and that man ordinarily a deacon! And yet in that northern jurisdiction is the great Southern Pacific Railroad, beginning on one side, and running through it the whole extent, now built about two-thirds of the way

through the counties. Upon our borders there are now springing up every week in the year farms, villages, and towns. When I came here three years ago I reported 800,000 inhabitants. To-day there are over 1,200,000 inhabitants, and most of this growth, or a very large proportion of it, is in that northern jurisdiction. I have travelled that country over from end to end—from its northern borders to its Mexican boundary—and the most of it on horseback. I never saw in the world so good a territory of cultivable land in so large an extent as is to be found in that northern jurisdiction clear down through the old Diocese, as it will be, and clear on to the Mexican boundary. When I came through there, but five weeks ago, I compared its fertility, as I saw it in the crop, to the very best lands of France, to the lands of Belgium, where each square mile contains 400 inhabitants, and such as would give our State 200,000,000 if it came to that. I compared them with the dike lands of Holland, and I tell you that in my life I have never seen anywhere such an extent of land as that. It is growing everything from grain to sugar. Every possible production that is found in the different zones of the earth, I believe, is substantially found there. There is in mineral resources the wealth of the world in iron, coal, silver, zinc, and gold. I have made it a rule in riding over that country to ride over the very pinnacle of every mountain that I have ever seen, and there is not a mountain that has come within my view that I have not ridden over its highest point on horseback. The world is going in there for its home. Our cattle graze all winter without being fed. This I tell you because they are the opening for the souls of men, because they are inviting the Old World and the New, because they are spreading forth their acres and giving to view all their productions to your Northern and Western men, and you are availing yourselves of them and going there to live; and yet our Bishop can never enter your parishes—you will have none—can never enter your towns—simply because he is human. I do not know of a single ditch except in San Antonio. We are not irrigating. Now look at one hundred and sixty-seven counties, organized as thoroughly as any counties in New York, being represented in the Convention, and represented in their Legislature, with one million two hundred thousand inhabitants, and tell me whether you think it does not need this relief. I am asked about the water. There are regions out in the extreme West, great stock regions, that are poorly watered, but there is the great stock-growing region of the continent. In New York the other day, if we cannot make a stir in this House, our bulls made it in your streets [laughter], showing what a country it is for the cattle of the world.

Now one word as to objections. A note comes to me saying, "I am told by different members that there will be no objection." I avail myself of that suggestion; but I wish to answer a point that I know is to be raised. It is to be said, "Ah, we cannot set you off, much as we should be glad to do so." I answer that the Diocese of Texas was constituted in 1849. In 1850 a large proportion of territory that you now see in that white square in the upper part of the map was ceded to the United States by the State, and yet it was the Diocese of Texas; the Church in Texas. The Church did not propose to go there; it never did go after that. It simply, doing what it now asks to do, abandoned that territory, and the Church in its authoritative capacity took up that territory, erected it into missionary jurisdictions, and it has now two missionary bishops covering that very territory.

In 1859 the Diocese of Kansas was admitted upon this floor; its boundaries were coincident with the old Territory. In 1861 the State of Kansas was erected, cutting off a portion of the old Territory, but in no way interfering with the lines of the Church. The Diocese extended still away out to Denver. The Provisional Bishop of Kansas asked another Bishop to take charge of it until the next General Convention—that part which had been cut off. At the next General Convention in 1862, it was by the action of the House, as found in your minutes, transferred, cut off, and given to the jurisdiction of the Northwest. Prior to 1862 it was found inconvenient to do the work of the two Dioceses of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. There was a parish in one that legitimately belonged to the work of the other, and upon the request of both those Dioceses and of that parish, the General Convention in 1862 transferred the jurisdiction of one parish in one Diocese to the other Diocese, carrying it from Massachusetts to Rhode Island. In Nebraska the same thing has occurred, and in Michigan. I have just had sent me by my own Bishop, taken from the minutes of the action of the House as given to him by the Bishop of Michigan, the following fact:

"When I was elected Bishop of Michigan in 1836, Michigan was not then a State, but a Territory, with a Governor appointed by the United States. The Diocese had been organized there a few years preceding, and was not confined to the limits of the present State of Michigan; Deputies were present from Green Bay and other parishes of Wisconsin. After my consecration, I resigned jurisdiction over every parish originally so organized. Michigan became a State, and at the next General Convention I resigned jurisdiction beyond the present State, and gave it up to Bishop Kemper," who was then the Missionary Bishop, and there he entered upon his work, and so it has been from that day to this.

Now, I am just through, unless more is to be said on the other side. It has been within the province of this Church from the beginning to work according to its necessities if it had no constitutional restrictions. It has acted upon the ground that it is sovereign in itself for its own work, and when a contract is entered into between this Convention and the Convention of any Diocese the thing is complete. Who can complain? There is not one word on the subject in the Constitution. This Church accepts the territory. Our Diocese gives it up—simply giving up its work; and now the question is, Had we not better go on for ever working without a Constitution, as the old Church did, working simply by Canon as it is needed to work, rather than at this day, when God has opened the whole West to us, we should be trammelled, confined, cribbed, stopped from sending the Gospel and its messengers to living men, simply because the Church might have confined itself by the Constitution, but has failed to do it?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. 'Mr. President, the special motion which is now before the House, as I understand it, is simply to refer to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments a message which was received from the House of Bishops yesterday.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. That was my motion, but it was ruled out of order.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Then if I understand it right, the whole matter which now stands on the Calendar in connection with Texas and California is before the House for consideration.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. At the proper time I shall raise a question of order in that matter, that the Message from the House of Bishops is not before this House nor open for discussion.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will enquire what is the business on the Calendar?

The SECRETARY. The resolution of Mr. Burgwin, discharging the Committee.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. And other matters have been added to the Calendar to come up in connection with that resolution.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. When I read the report, the gentleman from Pittsburgh moved, as I remember it now, that as there was a standing order at twelve o'clock, this report should go into that matter, because a part of that business, indicating that there was something before it.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I should like to see the record of the order. Dr. Hall is probably right, but nevertheless I know of no order which has made this message from the House of Bishops, which covers a very important proposition, and which certain members of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments think probably we do not intend to commit ourselves on, as it involves a grave question of constitutional law—I know of no ruling that has thrust that matter forward with this to receive decisive action without consideration by a committee appointed to consider just those subjects.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the order of business.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from Texas has gone on at great length and argued the question of whether we shall concur in the message of the House of Bishops. After he has gone through his argument, now a question is raised virtually that he has been out of order all this time. I hope the discussion will go on in order. I hope the gentleman will address himself to the same question as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The question to which I proposed to address myself was the motion which I made myself when the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution was presented to the House without any resolution, and upon which I moved that the Committee be discharged and the report placed on the Calendar, so that when reached in its order the whole question which was involved in the report of that Committee should come before the House. Since that time several matters have come before the House of a kindred nature, and they, with a view of having the whole question discussed when they should be reached, on my motion were added to the Calendar to come up along with the original motion.

The PRESIDENT. That is the statement of the case as I understood it from the beginning.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Does this debate now range over all the questions, or only over the question of concurrence?

The PRESIDENT. The question of concurrence does not come first. The question of discharging the Committee and bringing up the whole matter of this report is the first question to be taken, as is stated by Mr. Burgwin; the other matters were by an order of the House put along in connection with that report, and with the motion to discharge the Committee, because of their being kindred subjects.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. While that is so, I certainly cannot be mistaken in this, that the gentleman from Texas distinctly called up off the Calendar the message of the House of Bishops, and moved to concur in that message, and his whole speech has been addressed to that. That was distinctly done. Several other matters are on the Calendar, germane to this, it is true, but he made a distinct motion that this particular message be taken up, which thereby gives it precedence over other matters. It has been taken up, and argued at

length, and now at this late hour comparatively this question of order is sprung.

The PRESIDENT. The whole matter has been taken up. If this report is adopted, it virtually settles the question which was argued by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I am satisfied with that if he is.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Mr. President, in order to bring the matter clearly and distinctly before the House and present my views upon it, I modify the motion which I made and which now stands on the Calendar by making this addition. I move that the Committee be discharged, and I now move the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the proposed alteration of Article 5 of the Constitution proposed at the last General Convention, and made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, and printed on page 201 of the Journal of the last Convention, be, and the same hereby is, finally agreed to and ratified as provided in Article 9 of the Constitution.

"And the House of Deputies further respectfully informs the House of Bishops that the above resolution was adopted by a vote by Dioceses and orders."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to ask what is the motion now before the House?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That the Committee be discharged.

The PRESIDENT. That was the motion, coming up in connection, however, with these other matters, so that the whole subject was to be brought together before the House. This motion to discharge will be first in order when the vote comes to be taken, as I understand.

Mr. McCRAIDY, of South Carolina. I beg leave to ask on what day the order was made that all these subjects should be taken up together?

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will inform the gentleman.

The SECRETARY. The record is as follows:

"The resolution offered by Mr. Burgwin was made the special order for the eighth day. It was subsequently on the twelfth day placed at the head of the Calendar, and later on the same day the previous report of the Committee was ordered to be considered with it.

"Message No. 34 from the House of Bishops was placed on the Calendar last night, and it was suggested by some member that it be considered in connection with this, but no action was taken."

The PRESIDENT. I understand that action was taken, but it is not on the record.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I have again to ask the Chair, before the motion proposed or suggested by the gentleman from Pittsburgh, what was the question before the House?

The PRESIDENT. As it seems that no record was made of the motion to put the message from the House of Bishops on the Calendar, in connection with the other matter, the report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution is the matter now before us.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. What report?

The PRESIDENT. The report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, in reference to which a motion was made that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I understand the Committee is discharged by its report. It makes a report without any resolution, and, *ipso facto*, is discharged by the making of that report.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I presume if a motion is made to discharge, that motion is put on the Calendar by order of the House.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. If the question then be that the Committee be discharged from the consideration of this subject, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pittsburgh to point out the relevancy of his amendment to that proposition.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It is perfectly plain to my mind. I moved that the Committee be discharged, simply because they have expressed their opinion and given their argument to the House; and it is now before the House. If we are of the opinion that the Committee are mistaken, we ought to go on and ratify and agree to the proposed amendment, which was submitted to them, and which they reported had not been constitutionally proposed in the last General Convention. I think, if gentlemen will not interrupt me, I can state the matter which I now wish to bring before the attention of the House in such a way, at all events, as to make it clearly understood what I mean.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Allow me to suggest that obscurity will be avoided if the gentleman will simply move to disagree to the report. I suppose the question is whether the House agrees to the opinion of the Committee. If the House shall disagree, then the motion to amend the Constitution will be in order.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I rise to a point of order, and I believe I can make it clear. In the first place came in a resolution, and it was put upon the Calendar, a resolution connected with the report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. It is put upon the Calendar. Then the gentleman from Pittsburgh comes in with another proposition, that the Constitutional Amendment be ratified, and that is put upon the Calendar, to come up at the same time. Then comes in a message from the House of Bishops which underlies the first and perhaps the second, and that is put upon the Calendar also. I rose this morning and asked that the message from the House of Bishops be taken up and disposed of. They are all here for disposition at this time; but you cannot dispose of three propositions at the same moment. I have been allowed by the House to take up the message from the House of Bishops. It is the matter before us, to be decided before the others are decided, for you cannot decide three questions together. When that is decided, then comes up No. 2, and, when that is decided, then No. 3. Now, if the message be concurred in, then the Report from the Committee on Constitutional Amendments becomes perfectly immaterial. The question raised by the gentleman from Pittsburgh may be material, but not to this issue. It is only to a constitutional amendment for the future in matters that it will touch.

Now, I say, and my position is this: no gentleman should speak save to the question of the message. When that is decided, the gentleman from Pittsburgh can raise his point next upon the Calendar, argue it, and get it decided. Then, if the gentlemen of the Committee choose to ask that their report should be accepted, they may ask it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Have I the right to go on, sir?

The PRESIDENT. I think you can argue the case, but I do not think the motion made by you is relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. If there was a motion made to concur in the message from the House of Bishops, I did not hear it.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I made the motion. Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I did not so understand; but I understood that it simply came up because the order of the day had been called for. The Calendar had been called for. The Chair announced that the hour of 12 had arrived, and as I

understood—but I may be mistaken—then the Deputy from Texas, or some other gentleman, inasmuch as the message from the House of Bishops referred to the same subject-matter, and could be discussed in connection with all the other matters then upon the Calendar, asked that it be put there, or rather that it be taken up with the order of the day as a part of the order of the day. I certainly so understood, and I listened to his argument with a great deal of interest, and considered that it was a part of the argument which I had intended to make, but which he so ably made as to render it unnecessary for me to touch those points; and then I proposed simply to argue on the main issue I had made upon the report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments whether we did not already have a proposition for the amendment of the Constitution which, upon our adoption of it to-day, would settle all these questions finally and for ever.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Allow me to make a statement. I rose and stated the fact that three things were upon the Calendar set for the same time, and I moved that the message from the House of Bishops be taken off, and then said: "When it is taken up, I further move that it be concurred in."

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I wish to make a suggestion. We are all very anxious to despatch the business of this House. Now I hope I may be pardoned for the suggestion I rise to make. As I understand the case, the question before this body is whether we shall give to Texas these missionary jurisdictions? It is supposed there is a constitutional difficulty in the way of doing this. At the last Convention a constitutional amendment was proposed, but owing to the adjournment of the House of Bishops without action that constitutional amendment failed; and if a constitutional amendment had been necessary Texas would be delayed another term of three years. Then we raised a Constitutional Committee, composed of the ablest lawyers of this House, not to report any action, but they have reported to this House as their deliberate opinion that there is no constitutional difficulty in the way, and, as my colleague from Virginia has already said, that does not require the action of the House, but the House can vote upon concurrence or non-concurrence in the proposition to give Texas a missionary jurisdiction. If it believes a constitutional amendment is necessary, it will vote against concurrence on that ground. If it is not necessary, members will vote for the proposition on its merits.

I submit, therefore, that the question of constitutionality is not before this House, and there is no propriety in making that question now. All will be satisfied, and all views will be answered; if we confine ourselves to letting the question before the House be, Will we concur in the action of the House of Bishops? I say again, those who think we cannot constitutionally do it will vote against it; but when a committee of able lawyers report their opinion to us who have asked their opinion, it seems to me the quickest way is to take the question on whether we shall concur in the message of the House of Bishops.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have no objection to confining myself to any question which the Chair now says is the only one before the House.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. In order that the gentleman may go on without impediment, let me state that the Committee on Constitutional Amendments have reported that this thing can be done in a certain way. Members of that Committee, as I suppose from certain things that have happened, are doubting whether the Bishops have put their resolution into language to do it in that way. Therefore, if

you do concur with the language of the House of Bishops before the Committee have consented to that language, you are not doing it in the way the Committee have suggested. That is the difficulty in their minds.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I understand that, and intended to bring it to the attention of the House. The House of Bishops in their message provided simply for the Diocese of Texas:

"That the General Convention hereby signifies its consent and agreement to the limitation of the Diocese of Texas, as hereinbefore described, and that so much and no more of the State of Texas as lies within the aforesaid limits is to be regarded and known as the Diocese of Texas."

If that resolution means anything, it means that from and after the passage of this Canon the Diocese of Texas is dismembered. A portion of its territory is set apart for ever without the power of retraction by the Bishop and Convention of the Diocese, for missionary purposes, or is made a part of a jurisdiction which may adopt the Constitution and come into this Convention as a Diocese.

Now I call the attention of the House to the report made by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, for whom I have individually and collectively the most profound respect. I call the attention of the House to the closing portion of their report, found on the bottom of page 3, in which they say, after setting forth the mode which they are of opinion can be adopted for carrying out the general purposes set forth in the memorials to the Board of Missions:

"This would be a full response to the terms of the resolution referred to the Committee; but it is proper to point out that this does not recognize the right of the Convention, even with the consent or at the request of the Bishops and Convention of any Diocese, permanently to dismember a Diocese."

If that means anything, it means that this Committee have very grave doubt as to the constitutionality of the proposed Canon from the House of Bishops, and it seems to me that it would be treating that Committee with disrespect when they have put upon our records a doubt at least which they entertain with regard to the validity of this Canon in case it should be passed. It would be treating that Committee at least with disrespect to concur in a Canon which has been sent down from the House of Bishops without giving them an opportunity of considering that particular question and reporting their opinion upon it.

Now, Mr. President, if I have been out of order in presenting the views that I have with regard to the constitutional question which was, as I thought, before the House, I hope I may be called to order. But the reason why I think it is in order is, that it is inexpedient now to concur with the House of Bishops upon a point involving, certainly, serious doubt, when we have it in our power, by the passage of a simple resolution, to put this whole question beyond all doubt. At the last General Convention, memorials similar to this which have now been commented upon by the delegate from Texas were before that body. They were referred to the Committee on Canons. They received our anxious and careful consideration. We all recognized the importance, the vital importance, to Texas and California of providing a remedy.

A subcommittee was appointed, and we heard the gentleman from Texas, and also the Clerical Deputy from California, now Assistant Bishop of North Carolina. The objection was then made that the remedy which they asked the Committee to apply was not constitutional, for the reason that the General Convention had no power to dismember a Diocese permanently. Such a proposition could

certainly not have passed through that Committee. But with a view, if possible, of meeting the difficulty and supplying the remedy, that Committee carefully and cautiously provided a Canon which they reported to the House, which Canon will be found in the Journal of the last Convention, page 81, in which, by reading it, it will be seen that the Committee avoided the difficulty suggested; and I may here say that even in the adoption of this Canon it was very difficult to calm the scruples of some of the members who were rather strict constructionists. At all events, the Committee agreed to report it. The gentlemen who had still, I may say, scruples, agreed not to force their own peculiar views on the Convention, but to let the matter pass *sub silentio*, so far as they were concerned. That Canon provides not only to meet the case of California and Texas, but also the case of a Diocese where the Bishop is for a time under a disability or where there is no Bishop. In those cases, and as in the cases of California and Texas, where there is a part of a Diocese which the Bishop, by reason of its extent or from physical impediment, cannot fully exercise the functions of his office, the territory may by the consent of the Convention of such Diocese, and with the consent in the latter case of the Bishop thereof, be placed under the Episcopal charge and authority of the Bishop of another Diocese or of a Missionary Bishop, reserving to the Convention of the Diocese and the Bishop the right at any time thereafter to retract that consent, and return to their former condition. This Canon was accepted by the Deputies from California and Texas as being sufficient in their view to meet the case. It was adopted by the House of Deputies, went to the House of Bishops, and was there adopted. Thereupon, I believe upon the same day that this Canon was adopted in the House of Bishops, a constitutional provision was presented to this House from the Committee on Canons, was passed and sent to the House of Bishops upon the eighteenth day of their session, remained there the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth days. It will be found on page 201 of the Journal, providing that:

"The General Convention may, upon the application of the Bishop and Convention of an organized Diocese setting forth that the territory of the Diocese is too large for due Episcopal supervision by the Bishop of such Diocese, set off a portion of such Diocesan territory, which shall thereupon be placed within or constitute a Missionary Jurisdiction, as the House of Bishops may determine."

That was proposed as an amendment to the Constitution because it was then seen that it was too late to rely upon meeting the question by Canon, and that these two Dioceses must at least wait three years. That was presented, as I said before, in the House of Bishops.

THE PRESIDENT. The hour for the recess has arrived; but before it begins I wish to correct a misapprehension in regard to a ruling of the Chair a while ago as to the point now immediately before the House. I did not rule that a motion to commit the message or anything else to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution was out of order. I only ruled that the motion was debatable, and, as Mr. Burgwin is aware, stated to him outside of the House that that was the particular motion before us, bringing up in reference to the effects of that motion the general question. This being the state of the case in my apprehension now, I will endeavor during the recess to examine the records, and place the matter in a proper way before the House when it recommences its session at two o'clock. The recess will now be taken.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I agree with

the Chair in his recollection. My recollection is that the only subject now before the House is the motion to commit the message of the House of Bishops to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. The Chair will remember, when the order of the day was called, this report was decided to be at the head of the Calendar. The Deputy from Texas moved to take up the message of the House of Bishops which was not reached in its order. I moved to refer it. The question then came up whether my motion to refer was debatable, and the Chair held that it was, and the Deputy took the stand.

THE PRESIDENT. That is the case. The House will now take a recess until two o'clock.

The House resumed its session at two o'clock P.M.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 35) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in Message No. 24 of the House of Deputies, and elects the persons named in the report of the Joint Committee to Nominate a Board of Missions as members of said Board."

The following message (No. 36) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That Canon 5 of Title III. be amended by substituting in place of Clause 11 of Section 3 the following clauses:

"[11] No clergyman shall be allowed to take charge of any such congregation until he shall have been nominated by the Bishop in charge, and have been approved of by the Standing Committee provided for by this Canon, and when such appointment shall have been accepted by the clergyman so appointed, he shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Bishop in charge.

"[12] The Bishop in charge may at any time, with the consent of a majority of the Standing Committee, dissolve the connection between the rector and any such congregation. *Provided*, that three months' notice of such dissolution shall be given to the clergyman and congregation.

CLERGYMEN CHARGED WITH OFFENCES.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom it was referred to consider and report on the expediency of so amending sub-section [3] of Section VII. of Canon 12, Title I., of the Digest, as to provide for the case of a clergyman being charged with 'offences for which ministers may be tried and punished,' committed prior to his removal to the Diocese to which he now belongs, but which have not been the subject of investigation or trial, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and that it appears to them that an amendment of Canon 3, Title II., will sufficiently meet the cases contemplated in the resolution referred. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 1 of Canon 3, Title II. of the Digest be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. If a clergyman of this Church belonging to any Diocese or Missionary District shall have conducted himself in any other Diocese or Missionary District in such a way as to be liable to presentment under the provisions of Canon 2, Title II., the ecclesiastical authority thereof shall give notice of the same to the ecclesiastical authority where he is canonically resident, exhibiting with the informa-

tion given reasonable ground for presuming its correctness. If the ecclesiastical authority, when thus notified, shall omit, for the space of three months, to proceed against the offending clergyman, or shall request the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or Missionary District in which the offence or offences are alleged to have been committed to proceed against him, it shall be within the power of the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or Missionary District within which the offence or offences are alleged to have been committed to institute proceedings according to the mode provided by the Convention thereof, and the decision given shall be absolute."

The PRESIDENT. The report will be placed on the Calendar.

CANON OF RITUAL.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I ask leave of the House to present and read the report of the Committee on Canons upon the Ritual question.

The PRESIDENT. Will the House grant leave? Leave was granted.

Mr. BURGWIN read the report as follows:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred resolutions adopted by the Diocesan Conventions of Kansas, Kentucky, and Virginia, a Memorial from the Rev. John A. Wilson and others, Resolutions presented by a Clerical Deputy from Louisiana, and three Canons relating to the subject of Ritual, respectfully report that we have given thorough and careful consideration to the foregoing Memorials, Resolutions, and Canons, and to the important subjects to which they refer. We are quite aware of their magnitude and weight, and of the deep solicitude on all sides with which is regarded our action in the premises and that of the Convention.

"In entering upon the discussion, we found among ourselves, as was naturally to be expected, great diversity of opinion as to the proper mode of dealing with a matter which has been the source of so much trouble and anxious thought in the Church; yet we were united in the opinion that the evil must be met, and in the determination to use our utmost effort to meet it fully and effectually. In order to this, we recognized the necessity that all of us, so far as could be done without a sacrifice of principle, should yield to some extent our individual views, both as to the real nature of the evil and as to its true remedy; that all of us should leave our own peculiar standpoints in the circumference, approach one another, and meet at the common centre. This we have done, and we now present you with the result of our earnest and prayerful labors. When we consider the diversity and contrariety of our several views on many subjects closely connected with that now before us, and then consider the remarkable unanimity with which this result has been reached, this Report being agreed to by every member of our Committee, we feel assured that it has been under the guidance of that Holy Spirit who maketh men to be of one mind in a house, and without whose aid our labor is in vain; and we trust that the still further result will be the removing of doubts, the quieting of anxieties, the driving away of false doctrine, and the restoration of peace to our Household of Faith.

"Oh! pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee."

"The Committee, therefore, unanimously recommend the adoption of the following:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following additional section be added to Canon 20, Title I., 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer':

"SEC. II. [1] If any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters, that ceremonies or practices

during the celebration of the Holy Communion, not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction (and, as examples, the following are declared to be considered as such:

"a. The use of Incense.

"b. The placing, or carrying, or retaining a crucifix in any part of the place of public worship.

"c. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of people as objects towards which adoration is to be made.

"d. Any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflections, and all such like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer), it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his Council of Advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2] If, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have in fact been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instrument or writing under his hand, to admonish the Minister of the parish to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if the Minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. *Provided*, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section I., of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon, the Minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be notified, and have opportunity to be heard in his defence. The charges preferred and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceedings in the case.

"By order of the Committee,

"WM. COOPER MEAD,

"Chairman.

"October 23, 1874."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not propose, Mr. President, in presenting this Canon now, to introduce it with any remarks in the way of a speech, but simply to say, in addition to what has been said in the report, that taking advantage of the resolutions which have been passed by the House of Bishops and concurred in by our House, providing for joint meetings of the two Committees on Canons, we have conferred with the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops, have presented to them the Canon which we have now proposed, and have received from that Committee the assurance that it would receive their unanimous sanction if we passed it and sent it to their House, and that they will recommend their House to adopt it on their part.

I now move, sir, that this report, with the Canon proposed, be printed for the use of the members, and that its consideration be made the special order of the day for Monday next at meridian.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Hymnal is fixed for two o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I prefer the matter of the Hymnal should not be mixed with this, because if one is fixed for twelve, and another for two o'clock, there would be a squabble for the floor.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I suggest, then, that this be fixed for two o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have no objection if the House choose.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to print this

Canon, and make it the order of the day for Monday, at twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I submit that at two o'clock on Tuesday the subject of the Hymnal be the order of the day.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. As cognate to that matter I should like an amendment which I want to offer also printed. It is short.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not think it is the right of a member to rise and present a Canon or anything else, and have it printed, in connection with the report of a Committee.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I ask the privilege of the House to offer it for information.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I withdraw my motion in order to allow the gentleman to go on.

DIOCESSES BECOMING MISSIONARY TERRITORY.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. We have entered upon the order of the day now. I want, as I promised, to unravel the questions of order growing out of the order of the day. The first mistake was made by myself, and I believe the Secretary was of the same opinion, that the message from the House of Bishops, numbered thirty-four, had been ordered on the Calendar next to the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. That was only an impression. There was something said about that, but in the confusion of the adjournment it was not done. Therefore that message is not now before us except by the virtual motion of the gentleman from Texas which has been seconded, but which was not put to the House, and requires a two-thirds vote to take up that message and consider it. The message not being before us, the motion to commit by the gentleman from Kentucky was out of order. I will now entertain the motion to take up the message, and if it is taken up by a vote of two-thirds, as I hope it will be in order that we may get along with the despatch of business, then the motion to commit will be in order. I would further state, as was stated by the gentleman from Long Island (Rev. Dr. Hall) that this message from the House of Bishops, not being in conformity with the recommendation of the report of our Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, the motion to commit will be a very proper motion in order that they may conform the action of the House of Bishops to this report. That being the state of the case, the first question will be, Will the House take up out of its order the message from the House of Bishops (No. 24)?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. May I ask what effect will that have, if it be carried, on the discussion now going on? Does it cut off the debate now under way, or lay the motion by, simply to take it up and put it on the Calendar in connection with the matters which are now before the House under the order of the day? It seems to me that is the way which I understood to be the decision of the case when I began the remark I was making. The whole matter was before us for discussion in any aspect which might be presented, because by having all these different questions before us we can apply our argument to one or the other with a view of putting the speediest and most effectual termination to this question which we all feel so much interested in, and in regard to which we do not differ among ourselves, except as to the best method of procedure. If this message be taken up, and we then have the whole subject-matter before us to be disposed of, I am satisfied.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The two sub-

jects differ very widely. The Deputy from Pittsburgh will see that they ought not to be taken up until the message of the House of Bishops goes to the Committee on the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. I had already ruled that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pittsburgh, in reference to the effect of the action of the last Convention on the constitutional question, was not relevant to either the message from the House of Bishops or this report. I think that ought to come up as a separate question.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Is not that very question the order of the day now before the House, and is not the motion of the gentleman from Texas to take up this message an interposition into our proceedings of a separate motion which ought not to have been entertained?

The PRESIDENT. The actual motion before the House was on this report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. We are considering that.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is the question to which I am addressing myself.

The PRESIDENT. But a motion has been made by the gentleman from Texas to take up the message of the House of Bishops, and if two-thirds of the House concur in taking up that message, it will be before us.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Allow me to answer that question. He made that distinct motion, and no objection was made, and, therefore, I say it is too late for this ruling after he had made an argument of an hour's length by the consent of the House.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. It does seem to me that after the floor has been assigned me by the ruling of the Chair upon the ground taken by myself, the first and pertinent thing before this House was the message; it is placing that message and me personally in a very embarrassing situation. I understand the motion to be to refer that message to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? There is not the slightest doubt that this House will take up the message of the House of Bishops, and then let the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky be acted on.

The PRESIDENT. I think that would be much the best way.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. There is to be no debate on that question of reference?

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Then I object. I claim that I had the floor at the time of recess, and wish to proceed with the remarks I was making.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I suggest to the Deputy from Pittsburgh that it will not take a minute to refer the message, and then he can have the floor.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Chair says that will be subject to debate.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I think there is a misunderstanding. It is not proposed, when this report comes up, that it shall supersede the motion of the gentleman before us, but it comes up immediately after that is voted on; it does not supersede it, but comes up in connection with it. The first question before the House is the report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, and that the gentleman has the floor upon. It is proposed in connection with that, not to supersede it, but take up the message of the Bishops, and as soon as it is taken up, I think the House will make such disposition of the matter that the gentleman from Texas will get the relief he wants.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not like to trust the House always on a question of debate. When they have an opportunity of debating a question, there is so much anxiety to discuss it that

I do not wish to open that door. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to commit. The Chair has decided that that motion is debatable, and we know not to what length that debate may carry us; and, as I am in the middle of an argument, I would prefer to finish what I have to say, and then the House may take such disposition as they think proper.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I think the Deputy has the right to do it, and I hope he will go on.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. When the House took the recess, I was following up the process of legislation at the last General Convention. After the Canon adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies had been negatived by the House of Bishops, the only remedy which the House thought would meet the case was a change in the Constitution. Accordingly, they proposed a change by vote of the House. It will be found on page 360 of the Journal of 1871. This proposed Constitutional Amendment provided for the cases of California and Texas, and was presented to the House of Bishops on the eighth day of the session. There was no action taken upon it by the House, that House having adjourned upon the twenty-first day, making parts of three days.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. The House of Deputies adjourned on the twentieth day.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pennsylvania. But the House of Bishops had this proposed constitutional amendment before them from the nineteenth day, and they adjourned on the twenty-first day. That raises a very important constitutional question as to whether that proposed amendment was in fact proposed under the terms of the Constitution, so that if we think proper to do so we may now finally ratify and agree to it. The question arises under Article 3 of the Constitution, which provides:

"And in all cases the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation (the latter with the reasons in writing, within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof it shall have the operation of a law.)"

That question was referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, and they have reported that, in their opinion, it did not come within the terms of the Constitution; in other words, the proposition failed because the House of Bishops adjourned before three full days had expired after they received this message from the House of Deputies. The proposition which I maintain, with the most profound respect for the gentlemen who compose that Committee, is that, upon the failure of the House of Bishops within the time which they certainly did set after receiving our act, that act became an act of the House of Bishops for want of their action. This, of course, is a question of legal construction.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. There was no House of Deputies to which they could return it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I say it is a question of legal construction; and in this connection, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the difference which exists between our constitutional provision and that of the United States.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Allow me to suggest to the Deputy that he take up the question whether he does not exclude one day and include the other; and if he adheres to that rule, then there were not three days.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. My agreement is entirely aside of the question of time. I claim that under the terms of this Constitution, were a proposition presented within five minutes of their adjournment, to take an extreme case, it becomes a law if they fail to act. I go to that extent. Of

course my argument goes for nothing if it does not prove that. The Constitution of the United States, which, you will bear in mind, was proposed by the Convention in 1787, two years before the adoption of our Constitution, provides:

"If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted), after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

I am not familiar with the Constitutions of the different States of the United States, but I am with that of the State of Pennsylvania, where a veto is given to the Governor. In that State the provision is, that if the bill be presented to the Governor within a limited time, he shall have until three days after the next General Assembly shall have met, and within those three days he must return the bill with his approval or his negative, showing, as I claim, that where it is intended that the party to whom the bill is presented for approval is to have the full term, under all circumstances, it is necessary to put such a clause in the Constitution; otherwise we are to be governed by the law as it is written. Our Constitution, drawn up two years after the Constitution of the United States, providing for a similar matter, leaves but that provision, and says absolutely, in so many words, without exception, if the bill or act is presented to the Bishops, and they do not return it in three days, it has the effect of law. Therefore on the letter of the Constitution I claim that this act, having been proposed to the Bishops and not having been returned within the three days, has the effect of a law.

I do not rely upon the argument alone, but I think that this question has been put at rest as a matter of precedent by the General Convention of this Church. In 1853 this same question arose. There was a difference between the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies in regard to a certain Canon which had been passed by the preceding General Convention, but had been presented to the Bishops, I believe, upon the day of their adjournment, and by oversight they took no action upon it. The question arose at the next General Convention whether or not that was a Canon of the Church. A Committee of Conference was appointed, and I call the attention of the House to the names of the members of that Committee of Conference. It consisted of Drs. Hancel, Andrews, and Craik, and Mr. Huntington, of Connecticut, Chief Justice Ruffin, of North Carolina, who upon questions of this kind was beyond all praise as a jurist and a strict constructionist, of whom it is not necessary for me to say a word here. Two of the Committee of Conference of the House of Bishops were Bishop Hopkins and Bishop Doane; Bishop Hopkins, it may not be known, before he applied for orders, was one of the most eminent lawyers in the State of Pennsylvania. He stood in the foremost rank of the foremost lawyers of his day. He was a man, not likely when he reached the House of Bishops, to yield any matter which concerned the rights and prerogatives of the House of Bishops. This Committee presented a unanimous report to both Houses, in which they say:

"The Joint Committee of Conference, having traced upon the Journal of the Convention of 1850 the Canon 'Of Ministers removing from one Diocese to another,' find that Canon to have been deliberately discussed in both Houses and by a Committee of Conference between the two Houses, and to have been so amended as to contain the provisions now incorporated into the Canon proposed as a substitute for the Canon XXX. of 1832, by the House

of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and, as so amended, to have been passed as a substantive act by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, duly communicated by message to the House of Bishops, and not subsequently acted on by that House, and thereby, by the terms of Article III. of the Constitution, to have acquired the form of law in the Church, but, by a failure of the Secretaries to notice the fact, not to have been numbered and placed among the Canons of that General Convention."

That Canon, I believe, was presented to the House of Bishops on the last day, or the day before the last. The report is signed:

"JOHN H. HOPKINS,

"Chairman of the Committee of the House of Bishops.

"CH. HANCKEL,

"Chairman of the Committee of House of Clerical and Lay Deputies."

On motion of the Rev. Dr. F. VINTON,

"Resolved, That the report of the Committee of Conference be accepted."

And so in the House of Bishops:

"Which, on motion of Bishop Hopkins, seconded by Bishop Whittingham, was accepted."

I claim, therefore, not to extend this argument to any greater length, that by the unanimous action of this General Convention establishing a precedent, we have the right now, acting on that precedent and observing the rule of *stare decisis*, so important a one to be observed, especially in legislative bodies, to regard this question as closed. Indeed, unless in the clearest of cases, where there can be no doubt that it may be presumed that the House who established this precedent were acting hastily, without due consideration, we have not the moral right to set aside that precedent, and leave it still an open question with one decision for and another against. The rule to which I have alluded I believe is held by the courts indisputably, that where deliberately a judicial body or a convention after examination have adopted a construction of a particular law or constitution, that will be followed except in the clearest cases; and I think after having called your attention to the difference between the Constitution of our Convention and the Constitution of the United States, upon the same subject-matter, where the difference is so evident between what is there provided that in order to extend the time it must be specially provided for, and we, with that Constitution before our eyes, having decided it, it is to be presumed intentionally, we at least cannot say that the construction put on it by the Committee is not so clear as to justify this House in setting aside this precedent, and then leaving it an open question. I understand that that question was strictly before the Committee of Conference to whom that matter was referred.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. That was the change of a Canon.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Constitution applies to both the same.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I beg to enquire of the learned Deputy, because the authority is not known to us here and we have not the Journal, whether both Houses remained three days in session in the case referred to.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Canon of 1850 was presented on the last day of the session of the House of Bishops, and that question was the question upon which the Committee of Conference passed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. Has the gentleman read it? It was because the Secretary had failed to embody it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The fact that the Secretary had failed to embody it called for a resolution to put it in.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Was the Conference Report agreed to?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Yes, sir; that Conference Report was agreed to in both Houses, and since then the Canon, which was the subject matter of that discussion, has appeared on our books as a Canon of this Church.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The difference is that at the last Convention there was but one body, and this House did not remain in session three days, in order to let the House of Bishops exercise its constitutional power of sending back its non-concurrence or concurrence in writing, a power which the Constitution guarantees. That is very different from a Committee of Conference, for there both Houses act.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I beg pardon; the gentleman does not understand the case. The Committee of Conference had simply before them the question as to whether this Canon had been passed at the last preceding General Convention. It was not the report of the Committee on Conference on the Canon.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Allow me to state one fact. The act that was passed in the House of Deputies and the other House in regard to that had been thoroughly discussed through the whole body, and it was finally passed on the report of a Committee of Conference, the House of Deputies acting on the Conference report, and the other House not. That is the point I want made.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I cannot see the force of the gentleman's argument, so far as it goes to the construction of the clause of the Constitution. The Committee of Conference of 1853 found their report upon the single fact that this Canon of 1850 had been passed by this House as a substantive act, had been reported to the House of Bishops upon the last day of their session, and that they had not acted upon it after it had been reported, and that thereby under the provision of the Constitution which I have just read, it acquired the force of law. It matters not how frequently it may have been discussed in either House before that, the whole thing depends upon the question whether the House of Bishops were entitled to three full days or not under the Constitution. That was the only point upon which this Committee of Conference of 1853 had to pass, and they reported it to both Houses, and their report was accepted and approved. The Canon of 1850, reported to the House of Bishops upon the last day of their session, and not acted upon by them at the time, was held under the provision of the Constitution to have acquired the force of law. That was the point I wished to make.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Permit me to ask the Deputy a question. Suppose that the House of Deputies should send a message of that kind with a completed act to the House of Bishops, and then should forthwith adjourn, and the House of Bishops should continue in session one or two days after that, to what body could they return the act if they wished to return it with a negative?

I want to state also a fact in connection with this question. In 1871, the House of Deputies adjourned on the twentieth day and the House of Bishops adjourned on the twenty-first day. Consequently, if the House of Bishops had perfected and attempted to send back to the House of Deputies their negative of this change, they had no opportunity to do it. The House of Deputies had cut them off.

I hold, relative to the session of 1850, that there was a simultaneous dissolution of the two Houses. We received the House of Bishops and had the closing exercises, and forthwith they returned to their House and adjourned, and our House did the same

thing, with the exception of passing one ordinary resolution, relative to printing, I believe. The two Conventions were very different in 1871 and 1850.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I fail to see the difference in point of principle.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I say to the gentleman that three days are allowed by the Constitution, and if we deliver an act five minutes before the adjournment and the other House receive it, and then within five minutes both Houses simultaneously adjourn, it falls to the ground.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I presume their simultaneous adjournment is always in pursuance of a previous resolution to adjourn. Each House passes a resolution to adjourn, and adjourns when the time arrives. The point I make is, that when our action is presented to the House of Bishops, and they do not act upon it, do not do what they can to comply with the terms of Constitution, it becomes a law.

That is all I have to say in regard to that point. I may add, however, that the Secretary, as I am informed by him, acting upon this precedent, and assuming that this proposed change had been acted on virtually by each House, did communicate, as it was his duty to do, to all the Dioceses of the Church, the fact that such a proposed amendment had been adopted, and therefore the Secretary, in point of fact, did communicate this proposed change to the different Dioceses, as required by law, and is prepared to say that it was received. He can correct me if I am wrong.

The SECRETARY. I communicated the proposed change, following the precedent of 1853, and received official notification from the Secretaries of all the Conventions, and from every Bishop having Diocesan jurisdiction, that they had received notice of the same.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. We are therefore in a condition now, if the House should sustain the view I have presented, to ratify and agree to that proposed amendment, and if agreed to by the House of Bishops it ends this whole question in a constitutional way, and the Diocese of Texas or California or any other in like condition may avail itself immediately of the provision of that proposed change, and remove from this House the discussion and determination of all the doubtful questions which have been presented to us by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, where they report in favor of supplying a remedy through the Board of Missions, which I confess is something so new to me that I have no opinion on it either one way or the other as yet, and also remove what is certainly a very doubtful question in regard to the validity of the Canon which comes to us from the House of Bishops, which proposes, without any constitutional change, to dismember the Diocese of Texas by contracting its limits to certain specified lines, leaving beyond those lines a large amount of territory, with no provision whatever made as to what shall become of it. That would be an objection if there were no other to the adoption of this Canon. It is understood—so I have been told by members on the floor—that the House of Bishops intended the territory left out in the cold to be a missionary jurisdiction, but there is not one word said of that in the proposed Canon.

Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Allow me to suggest that it could not be said because they have a work by themselves, which this House have nothing to do with. They erect Missionary Jurisdictions.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. But the question would still meet us as to the Diocese of Texas, which has been a Diocese recognized by this Convention, whether, if we contract the limits of the

State, that portion lying beyond these boundaries will be a Missionary Jurisdiction under the control of the House of Bishops, or whether it is not still a portion of the State of Texas, and as such entitled, when it has six clergymen and six self-supporting parishes, to come before this Convention and claim to be a Diocese.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Let me ask a question to meet a difficulty on my mind. If our House pass an amendment to the Constitution and adjourns the next day, the gentleman contends that under the Constitution of the Church the House of Bishops cannot return it to us. But if that is so in one instance, why not the second time? Why can we not at this session pass something the day before we adjourn, send it to the Bishops, and adjourn the next day, and at the next General Convention again three years hence, wait until the day before the adjournment and pass the same subject the second time and adjourn and give the House of Bishops no opportunity to act? Does not that resolve itself into this, that this House can effect most fundamental changes in the Constitution without any action on the part of the House of Bishops?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The gentleman proposes an extreme case, and it is said that extreme cases make shipwreck of the law. Of course, that is the logical conclusion of the argument I have made. The gentleman's argument would be *ab inconvenienti*. It may be that our Constitution leaves us in that condition, that this House may take advantage of the House of Bishops by what I suppose would be called a pious fraud, and send them a constitutional amendment or a Canon with the view of having it go into effect by the impossibility of action on the part of the House of Bishops. I anticipate no such result.

Rev. Mr. BBOWN, of Michigan. May I ask if it is not in our favor in the last case? We have had a three days' session here, and does not this objection apply to the proposition now presented?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The gentleman's idea is that we might, if intending to get advantage of the House of Bishops, hold back our action until a few minutes, perhaps, before they are to adjourn, and then throw into that body a mass of legislation, and they, not being able to act upon it, it would become law.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I would like to ask any gentleman whether in any legislative body whatever concurrent action is not required?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Journals say: "On motion of the Rev. William Stevens Perry, D.D., of the Diocese of Western New York, it was

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to wait upon the House of Bishops, and inform them that this House has completed the business before it, and desires respectfully to enquire if the House of Bishops has any further business to transmit to this House.

"The President appointed the Rev. Dr. Perry as the committee to wait upon the House of Bishops."

Further on,

"The Rev. William Stevens Perry, D.D., of the Diocese of Western New York, the committee appointed to inform the House of Bishops that this House had concluded the business before it, reported that the committee had discharged the duty assigned to it, and that the House of Bishops had no further communications to transmit to this House."

Showing at least that the House of Bishops was informed that this House was about to adjourn, and sent back a message that they had no further action; and it certainly strengthens the argument by showing that they were not taken by surprise, and that they were not forced by the sudden action of this House to act unadvisedly, or let the matter have the effect of law.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. This House cannot adjourn without the consent of the House of Bishops, so that if we send a thing up at the last moment they can keep us in session.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I understand the practice to be always before this House adjourns to send such a message as I have read to the House of Bishops, asking if they are ready to adjourn, and whether they have any further business.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. They have it in their power to hold us in session until they can act.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I think so practically.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. They did actually hold us in session four or five hours after that time until another Committee was appointed, and then they adjourned.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. This communication was presented to them on the nineteenth day, and they did not adjourn until the twenty-first day. All this discussion simply goes to show that in this particular instance there was no intention to impose on the House of Bishops, though of course that does not touch the argument. The gentleman from Georgia asks me whether this House would have the right to pass an act and send it to the House of Bishops at the last moment, and compel them to act upon it at the risk of its becoming a law unless they did so. My answer is, that that is an argument *ab inconvenienti*, and ought not to be taken into consideration in the construction of the Constitution. If it be so, then the matter lies in our hands, and we may propose a change of the Constitution by which the Bishops shall have, if we think proper to give it to them, three full days before such a law shall go into effect. But having no such clause in our Constitution, I claim that we must be bound by the words which are there.

Therefore, Mr. President, to bring my remarks to a close, in the view which I have presented to the House all we have to do is to pass the resolution which I have read, that this Constitutional Amendment has been proposed under the tenor of the Constitution in the Convention of 1871—because it does not require that it shall pass, but that it was proposed there—and that we now, assuming that it has been proposed, by a resolution ratify and confirm it as such. If that be agreed to by the House of Bishops—and I think with the precedent before them we have no reason to anticipate any objection upon their part, especially as their action in so doing will remove this whole difficulty and enable these Dioceses, without any constitutional objection, and in the way which they most require, to attain the object which they seek—this House would show its wisdom in following that system and adopting that resolution.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I would ask the gentleman if this precedent of 1853 would be a law before the House of Bishops?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The question has not been brought before the House of Bishops, because it does not get there until we send it. Whether it was brought distinctly before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, I do not know. I am informed that this was the first question which came before them. Whether they gave a long time or a short time to the examination of precedents, I am not aware. They have given us, I believe, no reasons for the position which they take in reporting to the House that it was not passed at the last Convention, so as to entitle this House to now adopt it. The Committee, of course, can answer for themselves as to what amount of consideration they gave it—whether it was upon deliberate consideration,

after the examination both of the Constitution and precedents, or whether it was adopted as a matter of first impression.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota, obtained the floor.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Was not the adjournment governed by mutual consent?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It was governed, I presume, by the general law that where there is a Convention composed of two houses, neither can adjourn without the consent of the other. I know that has been the practice, and I presume it has been so held.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Both Houses adjourned by mutual consent, but the House of Bishops sat as a council on the twenty-first day. It sat as a council and acted as a council.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Suppose this declaration of ours, that the amendment has constitutionally passed, goes up before the House of Bishops, and the House of Bishops disagrees with us, is this House ready to appoint a Committee of Conference, before which Committee of Conference shall be placed the arguments we have heard this day with regard to the validity of the passing of this amendment? I may say that I think the gentleman who has had the floor has distinctly shown that we have a legal precedent, and the arguments of those who have opposed his view have gone solely on the fact that the Constitution should be more certainly defined with regard to the three days. I may say that the position which he has taken is precisely the position with regard to three days that is taken in the Scriptures. Our Saviour—

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I must rise to a point of order. If gentlemen can seize the floor and begin an argument without having the floor assigned to them, we shall never get through.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Wisconsin is out of order. He commenced by asking a question, but is making a speech.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I beg to apologize. Still—

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Burgwin, I thought, yielded the floor, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Wilder).

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have not yielded the floor, but I simply intended to reply to the query of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Burgess). He stated that the House of Bishops only sat as a Council upon the last day. I do not find it so to be, because among the proceedings of the 21st day is the following:

"The House met at a quarter-past nine o'clock, pursuant to adjournment.

"Present," etc.

"The House being bidden to prayer, the Bishop of Wisconsin read a portion of Scripture, and the Bishop of Ohio offered prayers.

"The minutes were read, and, on motion, approved.

"Message No. 89, from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, being called up,

"On motion of the Bishop of Maryland, it was

"Resolved, That a Committee of three members of this House be appointed," etc.

Showing that the House of Bishops upon that day did sit as a co-ordinate branch of the General Convention.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Now turn to page 382:

"The Bishop of Western New York offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Bishops will meet in Council to-morrow morning, October 27, at half-past nine o'clock.

"The resolution was adopted. Ayes, 31; noes, 3.

"The Bishop of New Jersey, from the Committee on the Closing Services of the Convention, presented a report proposing an order of services, which order was adopted."

And in another place it will be found that agreement was made to adjourn.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I rise to a question of order. We are having speeches within speeches, and we are not going to get through at this rate.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not think it is at all important whether they had two days or three days or an hour.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Wilder is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I sought the floor under the impression that the first question before us is the motion to commit the message of the House of Bishops to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. Am I right in that, or not?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir, you are wrong. The question now is upon the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and Mr. Burgwin's resolution discharging the Committee. In addition, Mr. Burgwin has now moved, as an amendment to his own motion, the ratification of the Constitutional Amendment, and that is the question immediately before the House.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. The proposition, then, if I understand it, is the question that arises upon the report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to the effect that that proposed amendment of the Constitution three years ago failed?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir, that is the report.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Under that state of facts, remarking in the first place that when the question arises, if it shall arise by-and-by, to commit the message from the House of Bishops to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, I may desire to be heard; but upon the question, as the matter now stands, I yield to Judge Comstock, who was the author of the report that is before us.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Is the question upon the adoption of the resolution of the gentleman from Pittsburgh?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir, the first question is upon his amendment.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I will make a few observations upon that in explanation of the action of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I believe we are all agreed that a Constitutional Amendment requires the successive action of two Conventions, which implies that first it must be the valid act of the first Convention; in other words, it must have the concurrence of both Houses, or else it must become a law by the failure of the House of Bishops to signify their concurrence or their non-concurrence within three days. That was the question referred to the consideration of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

The facts are briefly these, as they appeared before the Committee: The amendment was passed by the House of Deputies three years ago on the 25th day of October, and was sent the same day to the House of Bishops. On the following day, to wit, the 26th of October, the House of Deputies adjourned finally, and on the next day, that is, the second day, the House of Bishops also adjourned. The article of the Constitution which is brought especially under consideration declares that the acts of this House shall become laws unless the non-concurrence of the House of Bishops be signified back to this House within three days after they have received the message. It was the opinion of the Committee, not upon a careless consideration, but upon a careful one, that that provision of the Constitution fairly implied that the House of Bi-

shops were to have the whole of three days, or at all events, if they were prevented from having the three days by the action of this House in adjourning, the act of this House did not become a law; in other words, that this House was bound to remain in session, and give them that constitutional period of three days for the consideration of the message sent to them. Upon that ground, one carefully considered by the Committee, they were of the opinion that the amendment fell to the ground; and, therefore, although it was erroneously notified to the Diocesan Conventions, it was not in a condition for this present Convention to act upon.

Now, without saying much about precedents, I think I may fairly submit it to the common sense of this House, lawyers, laymen, and clergymen, that under a Constitution which reads like that, the other House of this great legislature fairly has its right to three days to send back its message to this House of concurrence or non-concurrence, and that if we intercept that right by breaking up our sitting on the next or the day following, then the measure has fallen to the ground. It seems to me that the common sense of every mind will come to that conclusion. A precedent has been spoken of. I am not very familiar with all the circumstances of that precedent, but I think it will be found that the exact question was not brought fairly under consideration then; in other words, that it was never adjudged upon a solemn argument of the question. That is enough. Sir, as a lawyer and some time as a judge, I know something of the value of precedents, but there is no iron rule that they should be always adhered to. The law is at extremity, trying to get right, and if it does not get right the first time, it tries again until it gets down to a firm and solid basis, where it will stand forever. If some former Convention has inadvertently passed a measure in derogation of these views, I say this House had better consider that question.

And I am very sure of one thing, that whatever may be the judgment of the House on this question, the other House never would concur in the views of this rule which have been presented by the gentleman from Pittsburgh. He carries the argument to the extreme extent that if we pass a measure and send it to the House of Bishops and adjourn in five minutes, before they have time even to take it up and vote on it, it has become a law of the Convention. Precedent or no precedent, I think that extravagant and absurd; and yet that is the inevitable consequence if his views are to be held.

I think this states the whole case, Mr. President, and I do not wish to multiply words upon it. These were the carefully-matured views and judgment of the Committee. I may add also that unanimously the Committee are prepared to abide by them.

Mr. WOOLWORTH, of Nebraska. I will ask the gentleman if the report of the Committee was not unanimous?

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. It was.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is proposed to be governed in this case by the precedent of 1853, and I must submit that that would be so far from the rules of common sense that I never will assent to any such construction. When laws, either forming Constitutions or Canons, are passed or ordained, from the very nature of them they never can be so expressed as that there will be no doubt about their meaning. If every word in our language had a decided meaning, and no other, then such might be the case; but we all know that that is thoroughly impossible. When these Constitutions, Canons, or laws come before us for construction, we have certain rules to guide us to a

proper conclusion in relation to assigning the true meaning of the language in such Constitution, Canon, or law. The first is to enquire what is provided for in the Constitution or Canon, and then the precise form of words adopted in those Constitutions, Canons, or laws.

Now, what is the case here? Every Canon and every Constitutional Amendment must be concurred in by both Houses in order to become effectual. It must be passed in this House and then sent to the other. You can see that if a Canon was passed by the House of Deputies and sent to the House of Bishops, and no limitation of time was fixed in the Constitution, and it was not returned, it might always fail for the want of a return from the House of Bishops. That is in the nature of a bill originating in the House of Representatives, and sent to the Senate. In order to meet that, the Constitution fixed three days as the limit of time for the House of Bishops to act. Why was that adopted? Certainly, to give the House of Bishops an opportunity to consider it, and after due consideration to return to us the result of their deliberation. Nobody can doubt that such was the purpose of that provision.

Now, the gentleman says if we pass a Canon and send it to the House of Bishops, and then if we adjourn in five minutes, it will not affect it. I ask this Convention whether that is not contrary to common sense. It is impossible in the very nature of the case for them to give it any kind of consideration. Would this House become the sole legislature of this Church? It cannot be; but if the gentleman's position is correct, we cannot come to any other conclusion. There is no such thing as this House passing a Canon alone. There is a provision in the Constitution, that in three days, if not returned with or without concurrence, it shall become a Canon of the Church. This is expressed carefully on account of the right of any question to be heard. It is true everything was not put in our Constitution, but it was proposed to give the other House three days for the necessary consideration of a Canon, and for what purpose? That at the end of that time it might become a law, or if returned with objection be done away with altogether. Certainly this House of Deputies is not the whole legislature of the Church, and I shall not give my assent to any such proposition.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I am sorry to differ with the distinguished gentleman from Pittsburgh at any time, particularly upon a question like this, which is practically one in the future of so much importance. But before going further I wish to say of this memorial from Texas, that in my opinion the gentleman was further from the mark in no part of his argument made to this House than when he said he considered the vote on this proposition as controlling the memorial from Texas. They are entirely different and controlled by different rules entirely. One is an amendment to the Constitution of the Church, and the other has been reported by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and requires no Constitutional amendment at all. And the gentleman must allow me to say that the parallel he drew between the proposed action here and that of the Convention of 1853 produces no parallelism at all, in my humble opinion. That, in the first place, was not legislation so far as we can see from the proceedings he has read, notwithstanding the distinguished names that bore out that report. The name of Judge Ruffin, of North Carolina, was, I believe, at the head of the report. It was entirely apparent from their reading of the Constitution that either those gentlemen must have had before them some circumstances we do not now see, or for some reason it was not maturely considered.

But, sir, that was no amendment to the Consti-

tution of the Church. That was an entirely minor and inconsiderable matter. It was merely the passing of some Canon—what Canon he did not state—where they might possibly have strained the construction of the Constitution in order to put that Canon in position. Is that the case here? What do we propose to do here now? We propose now to change the fundamental law of this Church, the Constitution of this Church, not only to operate for this one occasion, but, Mr. President, when we recollect the large expanse of our country, the whole missionary field, the arrangements that must exist both in Texas and California, and various jurisdictions in the future, this is going to be a great question, and it is insisted that we shall be controlled by precedent in our fundamental law. Most assuredly not. Constitutions do not stand on anything of this sort. What are precedents and how are they esteemed? What do legislators do with precedents? When in a Constitution or in some other paper which is to be considered, whether by a court or by a legislature, the language of that paper is doubtful, and it is submitted to a committee, or passed upon by court, legislature, or what-not, a precedent has been established, because it may read one way as well as—or almost as well as—another way. Then, when the precedent is followed and you add precedent to precedent and construction to construction for a series of years, precedent has then the force of law, because, as the distinguished judge of New York says, it rests then upon a solid and sound foundation.

But what have you here? What is this precedent? It is a precedent upon a minor matter. It was established, it is true, by distinguished gentlemen. There are only six of them, however, in number; and what do we offer here as an offset to that? In the first place, we offer the report of our Committee—a committee of twelve instead of six—a committee which, although they are hallowed, so far as I know them, by their distinctions and memories, yet I think our present Committee in future will be just as much hallowed in their distinctions, which is as great as that which rests on those gentlemen who have gone before. Now we present their report, which cannot yet be said to have matured into a precedent. It was never acted on but once. Before that we never had any such action. Since that we never had. And now when we submit this same question to our distinguished Committee, for they are a distinguished Committee, and they are twice as large as the former one, they report against the precedent, and I say they are certainly entitled to as much weight as the original decision of the Committee of 1853. Now let us start out anew. I set off this report against the former report. What is the language of the Constitution? So plain that no two men, it seems to me, can doubt. The proposition is to change the Constitution, which is in this plain and simple language:

"And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation (the latter with their reasons in writing), within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law."

What are the facts? It seems that at our last session we went through the forms required by law, so far as this House could, to cause this change in the Constitution. On the 25th day of October we sent that to the other House, and on the 26th, the very next day, we adjourned, so that they could not have the three days to consider. The gentleman from Pittsburgh, and some other gentlemen, seem to think that these three days are a matter of convenience to the House of Bishops. Not at all; that is not the idea. The idea

is much graver than that. The idea is that these questions of amendments to the Constitution are always grave and important questions. The House of Bishops have grave and important questions before them at all times, and three days, a very short time too, must be allowed to them to make up their minds in discussing and maturing measures.

Now, the gentleman says, if it is sent to them within five minutes before their adjournment, we having performed our part of the work, and they failing to act, although we adjourn in five minutes, and there is nobody here to send it back to, yet it is a law. And another gentleman suggests that our House does not adjourn without sending to the other House for consent, and it is said that the House of Bishops by declining to unite in our resolution to adjourn on a certain day may hold us until they have time to act on all the business on their Calendar. This is letting the Constitution of the Church stand on mere courtesy between the two Houses, for I am ignorant of any provision either in the Constitution or Canons of the Church that inhibits this House from adjourning without the consent and assent of the House of Bishops. I say it is only an act of courtesy that we adjourn with them. I say more than that, but I have views peculiar on this subject. I claim this to be our Church, *par excellence* our Church—I mean the Church of the laymen. I have heard several here talk about various matters referred to the clergy or Bishops. I say no, so long as I have life I will cling to this Church as a layman and as the Church of the laymen *par excellence*, but I still say, notwithstanding these extreme views, so long as I sit in conjunction with the House of Bishops, whom I respect and honor, this courtesy should be extended; but when I come to fixed constitutional rights, and this is the foundation of the whole structure which we are building here—I say it must not stand upon courtesy, it must stand upon plain, legal writing, upon plain language which does not need construction; it must be in the fundamental law, in the Constitution, and not in courtesy.

The gentleman says that the proposition I submitted to him was an extreme case. Not so extreme a case as he put himself; and he went on to say that he did not care how extreme the case was. If we passed something and sent it to the House of Bishops and adjourned in five minutes afterwards, and they did not return it to us, it would have the force of law, if we passed it again at the next session. That necessarily resolves itself into this, and I will put a case a little more extreme, and there is no escape from it on his proposition. Say at this very time, we, the Clerical and Lay Deputies, had begun to change the whole frame and organization of our Church; suppose we determined to do away with the House of Bishops and abolish it. According to his construction, we have a right to do it. Just as we are going to adjourn, we pass a proposition to amend the Constitution by abolishing the House of Bishops *in toto*. We send it to them; then disperse and go home in a few minutes. At the next Convention we go through another such exhibition, and just as we adjourn, we pass for the second time the proposition to change the Constitution by abolishing the House of Bishops, and then adjourn. Would the House of Bishops be abolished? I say no. Let us go on not only according to the plain meaning of this provision of the Constitution, but let us go on with the dignity and courtesy that belong to our body, and certainly in so fundamental a matter as this, of fixing the Constitution, do not let us be driven to such extreme cases as the gentleman has suggested. I do hope this report will be adopted with unanimity.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Mr.

President, I wish to bring before the House something that I think will do away entirely with the precedent brought forward by the distinguished Deputy from Pittsburgh. The Constitution provides that the House of Bishops must return within three days a measure with their objections to it in writing. A case occurred in 1850, and I was present in that Convention as well as in that of 1853. The point that was raised was not that the House of Bishops did not return a measure within the three days, but that they did not return it with their objections in writing thereto. The House of Bishops did actually return the message within the three days' time, non-concurring with the House of Deputies, but failed to give their reasons for their non-concurrence; and the matter was brought up at the subsequent Convention of 1853 on that very point. The Canon was the Canon on Clerical Residence and Removals. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies passed a Canon providing that clergymen moving into a Diocese should be received, in general terms, unless some objection could be brought against them, so that they could be presented for trial. The Bishops had before acted upon the supposition that they could prevent a person from taking a parish in their respective Dioceses. This was a matter which the Presbyters of the Church had at heart, and so had the Laymen also. The House of Bishops non-concurred with this provision, and asked a Committee of Conference. A Committee of Conference was granted, and that Committee presented a report which was accepted in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, but was laid on the table in the House of Bishops. The acceptance of it in the House of Deputies having come before the House of Bishops, the House of Bishops then non-concurred in the passage of the Canon, and that passage was sent down to the House of Deputies. Then the House of Deputies allowed the report of course to stand. Three years subsequently they brought it up, and then a motion was made that this Canon be entered amongst the Canons of the Church, and that motion was passed by the House of Deputies. The House of Bishops finding themselves in this difficulty, preferred, in place of adopting that Canon, to adopt another Canon which the House of Deputies had in the meantime passed.

It will be seen that there is a plain difference. In the case of 1871 the House of Bishops received a message from the House of Deputies passing the amendment to the Constitution and voting to send it down to the various Dioceses, laid that message on the table, afterwards took it up and referred it to the Committee on the Constitution, and from that Committee it was never reported. I think the House can plainly see that the precedent is entitled to no weight. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. I move to lay the amendment of the Deputy from Pittsburgh on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. We are here, Mr. President, not so much for mere discussion as to act practically for the good of this Church. I think if the gentlemen who address the House, and who are anxious to express their views, would only remember that there is some little common-sense left in the body of those who constitute this House, we might save ourselves from a great deal of discussion, and approach to—get to action upon the various questions of great importance in which many of the number feel great interest. I therefore give notice that, when I shall be in order, I will offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That during the remainder of this session, no Deputy shall speak on any subject more than once, nor more than fifteen minutes at any one time, except by leave of the House expressly given."

I think, sir, that will facilitate our business. We are now approaching the close of the third week of the session, which is the ordinary limit of our meeting.

The PRESIDENT. There is another matter now before the House. The resolution may be allowed to go on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The Reverend Deputy from Texas has to-day brought before us a matter of vast magnitude. It is now many years since the hearts of this Convention were first turned by the trumpet tones of his voice calling to our notice the needs of a vast region that the Church would relax her hold, which is there almost upon the throat of the Church, and enable here to go forward in her appointed work, conquering and to conquer—

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman will please recollect that the question has changed its aspect since the Deputy from Texas made his speech. The report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments is now the simple matter before the House.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. And the object of the motion, Mr. President, is what?

The PRESIDENT. To discharge the Committee from the consideration of the subject.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I yield at once with the hope that I may get the floor presently.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I beg leave to make a motion to facilitate business. I move in connection with that special report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, the report which purposes to give relief to Texas on the principles therein indicated, that the message of the House of Bishops No. 34 be taken up and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, with instructions to make it conform to that report. I will state in a moment the reasons for my motion, and I think they will commend it to the favor of the House.

The message of the House of Bishops presents a very grave constitutional question, upon which I may say that there was a radical division in the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. I know perfectly well that that message of the House of Bishops cannot be concurred in by this House without a determined opposition and a long debate, because it proposes precisely the permanent dismembering of the Diocese of Texas, which many of the laymen and laymen of this House think cannot be done without an amendment to the Constitution. I do not share that doubt in my own mind. I do not believe the message of the House of Bishops proposes any violation of the Constitution. I do not stop to give my reasons, but I know very well that there are many members of this House abler and more learned than I am who not only doubt, but have a deep conviction the other way. I therefore say that relief in that way will not be given to the Diocese of Texas without a long debate and a determined opposition, and perhaps not at all.

But the special report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution—a report, I may say, that was unanimously made by them—proposes to give relief to the Diocese of Texas by setting apart a large portion of its territory, according to the wishes of that Diocese, as missionary ground, to be covered by the appointment of a Missionary Bishop or Bishops, without determining that the Diocese of Texas is thereby permanently dismembered. I think the House will agree, I think the Delegation of Texas will agree, perhaps without a division, to

give relief in that way, and then I wish to add that I suppose the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution collaterally with this subject will bring forward an amendment to the Constitution to cover doubts and to provide for future cases as they may arise. Therefore, I move that the Message of the House of Bishops be taken up in connection with that special report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, and be referred to that Committee with instructions to make it conform to the conclusions of that report.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, I am only too glad to hear what has just been proposed by the honorable Deputy from Central New York. I shall not detain the House with any words of mine now. I share his doubt as to the correctness of the decision at which that distinguished Committee has arrived. I think that it is competent to this Convention now and here, acting upon the consent of the Bishop of Texas and of his Diocese, to do what this Convention is empowered to do in the case of a Diocese seeking to be divided; that is to say, to grant the permission asked by the Bishop of the Diocese; but I agree with the honorable Deputy that there is danger of a long debate concerning a matter on which we are substantially agreed, and, therefore, in the full trust that that Committee will return a most speedy report that may be easily acted upon, I shall not pursue my right nor detain the Convention with one word more than seconding it.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. ["Question! Question!"] If the House is anxious for the question to be taken, it is all I want. I desired simply to say, in corroboration of what has been said by Judge Comstock, that the Committee on Constitutional Amendments will, if his resolution be adopted, and that subject be referred to us, act upon that question with as much promptness as my very worthy friend, the Clerical Deputy from Texas, himself will ask, he being a member of that Committee. ["Question!" "Question!"]

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Judge Comstock to take up the message from the House of Bishops, No. 34, and refer it together with the report from the Committee on Constitutional Amendments to that Committee, in order that the action proposed by the House of Bishops may be conformed to that report.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. Let me ask Judge Comstock whether he included in his motion the report that was under discussion?

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. That report embraces the opinion of the Committee that the proposed amendment to the Constitution has fallen to the ground for the reasons therein stated. I move that the House agree to that report.

The PRESIDENT. That motion has virtually been passed by laying the amendment on the table, I think. The Chair will put the question on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The original motion I made to discharge the Committee disposes of the report.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on discharging the Committee.

The Committee was discharged.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The following message (No. 37) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That this House hereby constitutes Japan a separate Missionary District.

"Resolved, That this House hereby appoints to the supervision of said district Rt. Rev. Channing M. Williams, D.D., the present Missionary Bishop of China and Japan, with the title of Missionary Bishop of Yeddo, having jurisdiction in Japan.

"Resolved, That this House hereby constitutes China a separate Missionary District, and will proceed to nominate a Missionary Bishop therefor, to be designated as Missionary Bishop of Shanghai, having Episcopal jurisdiction in China; and the House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has, in accordance with the above resolutions, nominated the Rev. William Pendleton Orrick, of the Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, Rector of Christ Cathedral, Reading, in said Diocese, as Missionary Bishop of Shanghai, with jurisdiction in China."

THE HYMNAL.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I tried twice to-day, and by accident have missed fire. I want to get the Hymnal off my mind and shoulders. I move that it be made the special order for two o'clock on Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to.

SHORTENED SERVICES.

Rev. Dr. DUDLEY, of Maryland. I desire to offer a resolution now, because by our rules of order after the sixteenth day no new business can be introduced. It has been agreed upon in the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution that we cannot, without an amendment to the Constitution, provide for any order of shortened services. It will be remembered that it seemed to be the almost unanimous desire of the Convention three years ago that there should be, if possible, some shortened form of services. Therefore, I propose this resolution:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to report upon the expediency of proposing an amendment to Article 8 of the Constitution, which shall authorize the alteration by Canon of the rubrical order of the daily morning and evening prayer."

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I suggest to the mover of the resolution to add to it "and if deemed expedient to report the amendment."

Rev. Mr. DUDLEY, of Maryland. Certainly, I accept that.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I think that matter has already been before the Committee on Canons, and is embodied in a report of theirs.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was agreed to.

COURT OF APPEALS.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York, offered the following resolution, which was on his motion referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That an Amendment of the Sixth Article of the Constitution be proposed, so that said article shall read as follows:

"The mode of trying Bishops shall be provided by the General Convention. The Court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of Bishops only. In the several Dioceses the mode of trying in the first instance Presbyters and Deacons may be instituted by the Convention thereof; but the General Convention may provide for the institution of a court or courts of appeal or for the review of trials. Until the General Convention shall make such provision, a court of appeal or review may be instituted and maintained by any Diocese or by any number of Dioceses confederated for that purpose."

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I present the following resolution:

"Whereas, by Canon 13 of Section 2 (page 57 of the Digest), the assent of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in General Convention is made necessary before the testimonials of a Bishop-elect can reach the House of Bishops, and a constitutional majority of the members must sign said testimonials; and

"Whereas, By the second article of the Constitution 'the concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the Convention'; and whereas, The Canons of this Church do not direct that the Standing Committees of each Diocese shall be composed of clergymen and laymen. Therefore,

"Resolved, That Canon 2 'Of Standing Committees,' Title III. (page 122), be amended by inserting after the word 'committee' in the second line these words: 'composed of an equal number of clergymen and laymen'; and that Canon 15 'Of Bishops,' Title I. (page 50), be amended by inserting the following words after the word 'each' in the third line, 'by a vote of a majority of the clerical and of the lay members.'"

This is merely to make the Canon correspond with the Constitution of the Church and the practice.

I move that it be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. I have a short business resolution t at I desire to have referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the House of Deputies, in making up the proceedings of this session of the General Convention for publication in the Journal for 1874, to strike out the words 'House of Clerical and Lay Deputies' wherever they occur, and insert instead thereof the words 'House of Deputies.'"

By the Constitution of this Church this House is denominated the House of Deputies; most frequently it is called the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, descriptive of the House and not the name. It is with a view to correct this that I offer this resolution, and I move it be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

HOURS OF SITTING.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I give notice that at the request of other gentlemen, I will move, to-morrow, to change the rule of this House so as to provide that hereafter we meet at nine o'clock instead of ten in the morning, and dispense with evening sessions next week.

The PRESIDENT. The notice will be entered.

PRINTING OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I now ask for action on the motion I made some time ago to print the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIALS OF CLERGYMEN.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I offer a resolution of reference:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution be requested to enquire whether there is anything that conflicts with the independence of the different Dioceses or with the spirit of the Constitution of this Church in a proposition that, in the case of the trial of a minister for holding and teaching publicly or privately any doctrine contrary to that held by this

Church, the consent and approval of two-thirds of the number of persons constituting the court of trial shall be necessary to a conviction."

I wish merely to say in explanation that now there seems to be held before the Clergy of this Church too much of a threat. Three years ago it was remarked that a provision of this kind seemed to conflict with the Constitution. The Constitution merely requires that the General Convention shall ordain the mode of trial. Now, I ask only that the same General Convention that ordains rules in regard to admission into the ministry shall ordain rules as to the exclusion from the ministry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

ABSENCE OF CLERGYMEN.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to enquire and report whether it be advisable to add to Section 7, Title II., after the words 'Bishop thereof' in line three, 'or when for a period of two years, although resident in the Diocese, he shall not have been engaged in ministerial work as defined in the Canons of the Diocese,' and after the words 'residence in his Diocese' in line twelve, 'or shall become engaged in ministerial work.'"

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I move that we proceed to the consideration of the business of the Calendar in the hope that we may clear the docket.

The PRESIDENT. No motion is required. The Calendar, is regularly before the House.

DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNICANTS.

The SECRETARY. The first business on the Calendar is the following resolution submitted by Rev. Mr. Shipman, of Kentucky, on the sixth day of the session:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a joint committee, to consist on the part of this House of three clergymen and three laymen, be appointed to consider and report to the General Convention what action, if any, is desirable in addition to, or in explanation of, the provisions already enacted by this Church, for the godly discipline of its communicant members."

The resolution was agreed to.

RITUALISM.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the memorial from the Diocese of Arkansas, presented by Rev. Mr. Trimble, of Arkansas, to which is appended the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the foregoing memorial be, and is hereby, adopted by this House, and referred to the House of Bishops."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that it be indefinitely postponed. It relates to Ritual, and we have a Canon reported on the subject.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that it be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to lay on the table takes precedence. The question is on laying this matter on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPUTIES FROM ALBANY.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on Elections touching the application of Rev. Dr. Hopkins for his temporary occupancy of the place of Rev. Dr.

Payne, absent on leave. No action was recommended by the Committee, but, at the request of several members, it was placed on the Calendar.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that it be taken from the Calendar and laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH CANADIAN CHURCH.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the report of the Joint Committee to meet the Delegation from the Provincial Synod of Canada in regard to such measures as that Delegation desired to bring before this General Convention, made by Rev. Dr. Rudder, of Pennsylvania, on the seventh day of the session.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I move that it be passed over for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the communication from the Provincial Synod of Canada, read on the seventh day of the session by the President of the House and provided for by message from the House of Bishops, No. 20, appointing a joint committee to visit the Provincial Synod at its next synodical meeting.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I thought that had been disposed of. If not I move that it be taken from the Calendar and laid on the table.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. What is the operation of this motion? They sent a delegation to us, and they ask in return, do they not, that we should do a like favor? Does this dispose of it?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. It is a matter that has no concern on our Calendar. If laid on the table it can be called up at any time, if it is necessary to call it up. It does not conflict with any motion to appoint messengers, or agents, or representatives to attend this Conference.

The SECRETARY. I would state to members that the House of Bishops appointed a Committee on its part. This House concurred in that action and referred the nominations to the Committee on the State of the Church. That Committee this morning sent in the nominations, and their report was placed on the Calendar.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Then it will come up.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that this matter be taken from the Calendar and laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

PERSONS ADMITTED TO SECRET SITTINGS.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the resolution offered by Rev. Dr. Locke, of Illinois, inviting the presence of the visiting clergy of Illinois and Wisconsin during the discussion of the report of the Committee on the Consecration of New Bishops, touching the confirmation of the election of Drs. Welles and Seymour.

Rev. Dr. CHASE, of Illinois. On behalf of the Diocese, I ask that that be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT. By general consent leave will be granted to withdraw the resolution.

NUMBERING OF CANONS.

The next business was the following resolution by the Committee on Canons, on the ninth day of the session:

"Resolved, That this House concurs with the House of Bishops in the adoption of the resolution communicated to this House, in Message No. 8, relating to Canons 8 and 9 of Title I. of the Digest of 1868."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Can the Secretary refer us to the page of the proceedings of 1871?

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. These

two Canons were simply dropped out in printing the Digest.

The SECRETARY. They were struck out by the adoption of other Canons of the same numbers, and the Committee appointed to certify changes did not give any instructions about renumbering these Canons, and consequently in preparing the Digest they could not be put in.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the adoption of the resolution reported.

The resolution was adopted.

MINISTERS FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The next business was the following resolution reported "from the Committee on Canons":

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the numbers 5 and 7, in Subsection 4, of Section 8, of Canon 13, of Title I., be changed to 6 and 8 respectively, so that the said Subsection may read as follows:

"4. Any Bishop or Bishops elected and consecrated under this section, or any Foreign Missionary Bishop heretofore consecrated, or any Bishop to whom the exercise of episcopal powers and functions in a foreign Church or congregation shall have been assigned by the presiding Bishop, may ordain as deacons or presbyters, to officiate within the limits of their respective missions, or in such foreign Church or congregation, any persons, of the age required by the Canons of this Church, who shall exhibit to him or them the testimonials required by Canons 6 and 8 of this Title, signed by not less than two of the ordained Missionaries of this Church who may be subject to his or their charge, or by two Presbyters of this Church, in good standing, connected with such foreign Church or congregation.

"Provided, nevertheless, that if there be only one ordained missionary attached to the mission, or only one Presbyter of this Church connected with such foreign Church or congregation, and capable of acting at the time, the signature of a Presbyter in good standing under the jurisdiction of any Bishop in communion with this Church may be admitted to supply the deficiency."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move the adoption of the resolution. It is a mere misrecital of the canons applicable to the subject matter. Where it says Canons 5 and 7 of this Title, it ought to have been 6 and 8 of this Title.

The resolution was adopted.

LAY READERS.

The PRESIDENT. The next business in order is the report of the Committee on Canons in relation to the appointment of Lay Readers, as follows:

"In relation to the enquiry whether a subsection relating to the appointment of Lay Readers by the Bishop should not be added to Section 2 of Canon 9, of Title I., the Committee report as follows: From an examination of the printed Journals it would seem that such addition would be proper, the same having been adopted in this House and not appearing to have been stricken out by the House of Bishops. But upon examination of the enrolled copy of the Canon, as sent to the House of Bishops and preserved among its papers, it appears that the subsection in question was, through an error of the Clerk of this House, appended to the preceding section (that is, Section 2 of the Canon as it then stood), the whole of which section was struck out by the House of Bishops, which, of course, included said subsection. The Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

AMENDMENT OF A CANON.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the report of the Committee on Canons in relation to a proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II., as follows:

"In relation to the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II., by changing the word 'or,' in the fourth line, to 'and,' the Committee report that they are of the opinion that it is inexpedient, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 1, of Canon 10, of Title II."

The resolution was adopted.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of a proposed repeal of Section 6, of Canon 13, of Title I."

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I really do not think it will conduce to the health of members of this House to remain longer in session. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to; there being on a division ayes 66, noes 67.

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is notice of a motion to amend the rules of order, made by Rev. Dr. Hubbard, of New Hampshire.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. My motion was to amend the rules so that the Chair might appoint a Committee on Rules of Order. If the House wish to go into that now, I will state my reasons for it.

My motion is to amend the fourth rule of order by adding to the Standing Committees appointed by the Chair a Committee, No. 14, on the Rules of Order. My reasons are these: There are many new amendments constantly arising and new rules proposed to the House. It will be a very great convenience to have a Committee on the Rules of Order, acquainted with parliamentary law, to consider these proposed rules and to report to the House.

The next reason is that we are not acting here under ordinary parliamentary rules. The rules of order, therefore, are to be accommodated to our especial use. A committee of this House would be both acquainted with the ordinary parliamentary rules, and have great experience in our own sessions in order to adapt these rules to our uses.

The next reason is to preserve the traditions of the House. I have noticed in several successive Conventions the same questions would arise, and having been determined in one Convention, they arise in the next Convention, and keep us in discussion for half a day because, simply, there was nobody in the House whose business it was to preserve the traditions of the House, and so to correct at once any proposition which conflicts with decisions already reached. This Committee will be to preserve the traditions of the House.

The fourth reason is that this Committee on the Rules of Order would form a body of assessors to determine questions at once, if possible—questions that are difficult to determine when thrown into the House.

These were my reasons for proposing this Committee.

Mr. DE MILL, of Michigan. I move to lay the proposition on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the resolution offered by Mr. Stephens, of Tennessee, on the tenth day, proposing a limitation of debate on the order of the day, which was at that time laid on the table.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that that be withdrawn from the Calendar, the occasion for it having passed over.

The motion was agreed to.

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, asking to be discharged from the further consideration of certain resolutions proposing a rearrangement of the basis of representation in this House.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that the Committee be discharged from the consideration of that subject.

The motion was agreed to.

REFERENCE OF MESSAGES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the notice of Mr. Burgwin to amend Rule of Order No. 12, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Rules of Order be amended by adding to Rule No. 12:

"All messages from the House of Bishops communicating any legislative action on their part shall, without debate, be referred to the proper Committee."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I would amend by adding "unless otherwise ordered by the House."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is not necessary, because the House always, by a vote of two-thirds, can suspend a rule.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I do not want a vote of two-thirds. "Unless otherwise ordered" requires only a majority.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I object to the amendment, because I think when a resolution from the House of Bishops, proposing legislative action, comes here, that it ought to go to a committee, unless it is so plain and palpable that we ought to pass upon it at once.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I withdraw the amendment.

The resolution was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS' FUND.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the following resolution, reported by the Committee on the State of the Church, on the eleventh day of the session:

"Resolved, That the Trustees of the Missionary Bishops' Fund are requested to issue a circular annually to the Rectors of all our Parishes asking an offering for this fund."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Does that require the concurrence of the House of Bishops? I move to insert the words "the House of Bishops concurring" after "Resolved." It will come with much more force if it be the result of the concurrent action of both Houses.

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

REMOVAL OF MINISTERS.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment of Subsection 4, Section 7, of Canon 12, Title I., proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 18."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The Canon as it stands provides that it shall be the duty of all ministers to obtain and present letters of transfer as above, whenever they remove from one Diocese or Missionary Jurisdiction to another, with the exception of Professors in the General Theological Seminary, officers of the Board of Missions, and professors in colleges and universities which are established by the concurrent action of two or more Dioceses associated for that purpose. The object is that the professors of the University of the South shall not be registered as ministers of the Diocese of Tennessee, but shall retain their domicile and the right of ministerial domicile in their respective Dioceses.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I should like to ask why it would not be as well to include in this exception professors of theological seminaries which shall be under the direction of more than one Diocesan authority? It is among the possibilities that the Diocese of Wisconsin may be divided, and if this Canon be passed without this exception, it would oblige the members of one of these Dioceses to transfer themselves to the other. There is the same reason why this exception should exist in this case as in the other.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I think that in view of the division of Dioceses, every Diocese should agree to this, else we shall be cut off or forced to accept ecclesiastical relations that we do not desire. I will also say that it adds one step more to the supporting of a Church College within a State, a Church Seminary, and other institutions of the same kind.

Mr. STARCK, of Connecticut. It is five o'clock, and I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that the motion first made on the report of the Committee on Canons be referred to the Committee on Canons to report thereon. I think that when Dioceses are divided, institutions that belong to both Dioceses need this legislation as much as any other.

The PRESIDENT. A motion is made to adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and the House adjourned until to-morrow, at ten o'clock A.M.

SIXTEENTH DAY.

SATURDAY, October 24.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at ten A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Charles Minnigerode, D.D., of Virginia. The Lessons were read by Rev. Duncan C. Mann, of Western New York. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. William P. Ten Broeck, of Wisconsin. The Benediction was pronounced by Right Rev. Ozi William Whitaker, Missionary Bishop of Nevada and Arizona.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

REFERENCE OF A MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT. There is a message from the House of Bishops undisposed of (Message No. 36), which will, under the order of the House, be referred to the Committee on Canons.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported that leave of absence for the remainder of the session had been

granted to Rev. Mr. Henry A. Coit, D.D., of New Hampshire, and Mr. J. L. Adkins, of Easton.

PORTION OF TEXAS SET OFF AS MISSIONARY GROUND.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I will offer a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution in regard to the Texas matter, and I will ask that it be passed at once unanimously and sent to the House of Bishops if there be no opposition. It is simply to avoid the question of dismembering a Diocese; otherwise it is the same as the action of the House of Bishops.

The Secretary read the report as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to which was referred Message No. 34 of the House of Bishops, with instructions to conform the terms of the same to the former report of this Committee, respectfully offer the following report:

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the said message, and proposes as a substitute the following preambles and resolution:

"Whereas, The Diocese of Texas, by constitutional action of the Bishop and Convention, has, for urgent and sufficient reasons, arising from the great extent of its unoccupied territory, declared its desire that all that portion of said Diocese lying north of Lampasas, Coryell, MacLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Smith, Gregg, and Marion Counties, and west of Matagorda, Wharton, Colorado, Fayette, Bastrop, Travis, Burnett, and Lampasas Counties, be set apart as a Missionary District; and

"Whereas, The General Convention is sufficiently assured of the consent of the parishes lying north and west of the aforesaid counties to the occupation of said territory as Missionary ground;

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the General Convention hereby signifies its consent and agreement to the setting apart and occupying as Missionary ground that portion of the Diocese of Texas hereinbefore described."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the resolution be put upon its passage at once.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to unanimously.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, submitted a report, which was read as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred the resolution of the Convention of the Diocese of Pittsburgh in reference to a Committee of Appeal, report:

"A resolution passed by the Diocese of Pittsburgh at its annual session on the 10th and 11th of June, 1874, has been certified to this Convention. It is as follows:

"Resolved, That in the sense of this Convention it is expedient and desirable that some such change be made in the judicial system of the Church as will result in the establishment of a Court of Appeal, where questions involving doctrine, discipline, and worship may be adjudicated by this Church.

"This resolution is now referred to this Committee to report upon the question whether a change in the Constitution of the Church is necessary in order to the establishment of a Court of Appeals.

"The Committee have carefully considered the question submitted, and report that *there can be no such change* in the judicial system of the Church, such as that contemplated by the resolution without a change in its organic law. The Committee does not pass upon the question whether such a change is expedient or desirable; under their power and this reference it is for them to bring the question simply to the test of the Constitution.

"The judicial system of the Church as existing under that instrument is simple and well defined, both as to its objects, extent, and jurisdiction. By the Sixth Article, where reference is had to Ecclesiastical Courts, trials, and sentences, it is declared that in *every Diocese* the modes of trying Presbyters and Deacons may be instituted by the Convention of the Diocese. Here is a jurisdiction and mode of trial designated, and this grant of power and the mode of exercise exclude its exercise in any other way. The language, 'every Diocese,' locates the jurisdiction. The term used, *trying*, indicates in the trial and its incidents a complete act. To these reasons may be cited the construction which has ever been given by the Church in somewhat analogous cases, leaving the Diocese perfectly free and independent to manage their own local affairs without any interference from the National Church.

"The Committee in conclusion recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from further consideration of the subject."

CHARLES H. HALL,

Chairman,

T. U. DUDLEY, Jr.,

BENJAMINA A. ROGERS,

J. W. STEVENSON,

EDWARD MCCRADY,

E. T. WILDER,

ISAAC HAZLEHURST,

SAMUEL B. RUGGLES,

G. W. RACE,

EDMUND H. BURNETT,

GEORGE F. COMSTOCK,

W. F. BULLOCK.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I offer this report to go on the Calendar.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. As it was on my motion that that subject was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, I move that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of it, so far as that report is concerned.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Why not adopt the resolution? The Committee have asked to be discharged.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I object to that motion, and I move that it go on the Calendar with the memorial from Pittsburgh. I think it should go upon the Calendar.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have no objection to that if there is any desire to have it go upon the Calendar.

The report was placed upon the Calendar.

ALTERATION OF PRAYER-BOOK.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, submitted a report, which was read, as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred the resolution to enquire and report whether the eighth article of the Constitution does not prohibit any alteration of the Book of Common Prayer, except in the mode therein prescribed, and whether a short or different form of prayer than therein laid down can be authorized by a mere Canon of the Church, have considered the subject, and respectfully submit the following report:

"The Committee understand, especially in view of the Canon now before this House for its consideration, that this resolution means to enquire whether, in the judgment of the Committee, it is competent for one General Convention, by a *mere Canon*, to prescribe or authorize a form or order of Morning or Evening Prayer, to be used at the discretion of the minister, as a substitute for the order

thereof, now laid down in the Book of Common Prayer; and that this enquiry applies to the service on the Lord's Day, as well as on secular days, since the power to change by Canon the order of service of one day necessarily implies the like power for all. Reasons of expediency or propriety may lead us to dispense with the full service more readily on a week-day than on the Lord's Day, but the question of constitutional power must be the same in both.

"The eighth article of the Constitution declares that 'a Book of Common Prayer, administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, etc., shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and that no alteration shall be made in such Book, unless the same be proposed in our General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention.' Under that Constitution we have a Book of Common Prayer with a prescribed order for Prayer, an order for *Daily Prayer*. The title-page declares it to be according to the use of the 'Protestant Episcopal Church'; and the Rubrics thereof direct that at daily prayer, at every daily prayer, the minister shall begin the same in a certain manner, and that he shall then say, etc., etc., and the order of his saying it, until the end of the Psalm. The question then seems to be whether the Rubrics are a part of the Prayer-Book, and whether an alteration of the Rubrics is not an alteration of the Book itself, and within the prohibition of the Constitution. The substitution of another order of prayer from that laid down in the Prayer-Book does not, in terms, alter the language of the Prayer-Book, either in its Rubrics or in its prayers. The text of both will still remain the same; and if the phrase in the Constitution against any alteration is to be confined merely to alterations of the existing phraseology of the Prayer-Book, the question might admit of a different answer; but your Committee are of opinion that a Canon which allows the whole or any material part of the prescribed order for the daily prayer to be omitted, and another and different order be substituted therefor, would be an alteration of the Prayer-Book within the spirit and meaning of the Constitution. To omit, to dispense with, to substitute one thing for another, is, of course, more of an alteration than a mere change, variation, or modification of language before used. It is true that the Canon introduced into this Constitution, allowing a shortened form of prayer, has been substantially enacted, and is now in force in England; but it should not be forgotten that in England no written Constitution limits or restrains the legislative power, either in ecclesiastical or temporal affairs, and in both the authority of parliament is supreme and omnipotent. Their action, therefore, does not seem to be a safe guide or precedent for us. Our written Constitution is our organic law, our Magna Charta, and must control and limit all our legislation. It is well known, also, that the article now under consideration was not found in the original Constitution of 1789, but was adopted by the Convention of 1808, of which those great men and legislators, Bishop White and Dr. John Henry Hobart, were leading lights. This article guards with jealous care the integrity of the Prayer-Book. It does not, indeed, provide that any alterations therein must be preceded by an amendment of the Constitution, but the protection against its alteration is even more guarded than if such were the case. For if an amendment of the Constitution only was necessary to authorise us to change the Prayer-Book by mere Canon, such Canon might be passed without three years' consideration of its terms. The proposition to amend the Constitution might indeed be before the Church for three

years, but the desired change of the *Prayer-Book* would not necessarily be. But by the present wise provision of the Constitution no alteration can be made in the Prayer-Book, unless the desired changes in all essential details have been proposed in our General Convention, made known to each Diocesan Convention, and adopted at the next General Convention, thus securing three full years for their examination and approval. And thus is obtained that deliberate sanction which the Constitution intended to secure in such an important matter. It is true that we now have a Canon (Title I., Canon 13, Section 14), adopted in 1832, allowing any Bishop to compose forms of prayer or thanksgiving for use in his own Diocese. But it is to be noted that by the very terms of his Canon such prayers are only for 'extraordinary occasions,' and its use is, in fact, limited to such occasions.

"It is true, also, that in 1871 this House did pass a Canon authorizing a short order of prayer, but in which the House of Bishops did not concur. It does not, however, appear that on either of those occasions the constitutional question now raised was considered, and your Committee have not thought that these cases furnished so clear a precedent as to remove their doubts as to the constitutionality of the Canon now proposed for the consideration of the Convention.

"The Committee desire to be understood as not herein expressing any objections to a shortened form of prayer to be used on proper occasions, but simply that such object can be properly secured only in the manner and form prescribed by the Constitution. The Committee therefore repeat that, in their judgment, a short or different form of prayer from that laid down in the Prayer-Book cannot be authorized by a mere Canon.

"Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from further consideration of this subject.

(Signed)

CHARLES H. HALL, G. W. RACE,
T. U. DUDLEY, JR., E. T. WILDER,
BENJAMIN A. ROGERS, GEO. F. COMSTOCK,
SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, EDWARD MCCRADY,
ISAAC HAZLEHURST, W. F. BULLOCK,
EDMUND H. BENNETT, J. W. STEVENSON.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would ask the passage of that resolution now.

The PRESIDENT. Is any objection made?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I would make an amendment to it.

The PRESIDENT. If it is to be discussed, it had better go on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I must move an amendment.

The PRESIDENT. Then the report will go on the Calendar.

STATEMENT OF THE TREASURER.

The Committee on Expenses, being called on for a report,

Mr. MATTHEWS, Treasurer, was allowed to make the following statement:

"I leave the Convention to-day, and do not expect to be back again. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Secretary has very kindly consented to receive the Diocesan assessments, as I am obliged to leave, and to forward them to me at Boston.

"I will also state that I was not here at the time the Committee on Expenses made their report, and I have since examined very carefully the items of expense that may be saved. We can save \$1000 in the reports; we can also save, I think, \$2000 in shortening the Journal. We paid at the last Convention, and very justly, \$500 to the Presiding Bishop for back services, and \$500 for the preceding three years. There was an extra \$500. Then I am

happy to say that the increase in the ministers in different Dioceses has been great, and the increased receipts will be still larger, and if the Committee on Expenses can keep the expenses of printing the Journal down, we hope to make the second assessment very small, probably not more than half what it was before. The printing of the Journal is the largest item. Other expenses cannot be reduced, but will probably rather be increased, as so many new Dioceses coming in naturally increase the expenses, although to offset that the increased number of ministers makes it up and perhaps a little more.

"I will now state, as I leave the Convention, that I hope to present my report for the next three years to the Convention sitting in Boston, where the Deputies will all be welcomed by High and Low Church—by all the Churchmen of the Old Bay State."

CELEBRATION OF DIVINE SERVICE.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. The Committee on the Prayer-Book, to whom was referred the memorial of sundry lay communicants, "humbly praying that no change may be made in the Law of this Church relating to the celebration of Divine Service," respectfully ask to be discharged from the consideration of the same.

I would suggest that the appropriate reference of this memorial would have been to the Committee on Canons. A similar memorial was referred to that Committee yesterday.

The PRESIDENT, The Committee on the Prayer-Book ask to be discharged from the consideration of this memorial.

The Committee was discharged.

RELIGIOUS REFORM ABROAD.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I have a report from a special committee appointed at the last Convention:

"The Joint Committee on the Religious Reform in Italy respectfully report:

"That they have received from the Italian Church Reformation Commission a report, which they adopt and herewith present to the General Convention.

"This Commission was constituted as follows:

"The Rt. Rev. A. C. Coxe, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Western New York, *Honorary President*.

"The Rt. Rev. M. A. DeW. Howe, D.D., Bishop of Central Pennsylvania, *Honorary Vice-President*.

"The Rev. Noah Hunt Schenck, D.D., *Chairman*.
Rev. B. I. Haight, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. Samuel Osgood, D.D., LL.D.; Rev. George Leeds, D.D.; Rev. Wm. R. Huntington, D.D.; Rev. Eugene A. Hoffman, D.D.; Rev. Edwin Harwood, D.D.; Rev. Wm. Chauncey Langdon, D.D.; John Cotton Smith, D.D.; Rev. Charles E. Hale; Rev. Albert Z. Gray; Rev. J. Andrews Harris; Leighton Coleman; Rev. Edward A. Fogges, D.D.; J. H. Rogers; Frederick S. Winston; Prof. Fr. Phil. Nash; Henry Chauncey; E. R. Mudge; Wm. M. Goodrich; Henry Meigs; James S. Mackie; Charles L. Cammann; Andrew H. De Witt; Wm. G. Low; Ernesto G. Fabbri; Nathan Matthews; S. K. Ashton, M.D.; John Stewart.

Rev. WM. CHAUNCEY LANGDON, D.D., *For. Sec'y*.

Rev. CHARLES R. HALE, } *Home Secretaries*.

Rev. ALBERT Z. GRAY, }

JAMES S. MACKIE, *Treasurer*.

"Your Committee express in the warmest terms their sense of the great obligation to that Commission, under which our Church has been placed, by their constant correspondence with and watchful interest in the movements of those who are encouraging reform in the Church in Italy, and by their efficient and generous exertions in maintaining in his important position the

Rev. William Chauncey Langdon, D.D., their Foreign Secretary.

"Your Committee also gratefully recognize the services of the Rev. Charles R. Hale, one of the Secretaries of the Commission, to whose pen they are indebted for the interesting *résumé* now presented of events during the past three years that have indicated progress in reform among the churches on the Continent and exhibited the character of the movement.

"Your Committee invite attention to those portions of the report which relate to cognate movements in Germany and Switzerland, and in Mexico.

"Your Committee further recommend, in accordance with the views of the Commission, the passage of the following resolutions:

"1. That inasmuch as movements for religious reform have extended beyond the bounds of the Church in Italy, and are being vigorously pressed in Germany, Switzerland, Mexico, and other parts of Christendom, the House of Bishops concurring, a Joint Committee on Ecclesiastical Relations and Religious Reform be constituted, in place of the Joint Committee on Religious Reform in Italy, whose office it shall be to give moral co-operation to movements in progress throughout Christendom, which are preparing the way for a return to Apostolic truth and primitive order.

"2. That such Joint Committee consist of five Bishops, five Presbyters, and five lay members of the General Convention.

"3. That the General Convention heartily responds to the sentiments of the Commission, when closing their connection with their Foreign Secretary, Rev. Wm. Chauncey Langdon, D.D., sensible of his efficiency in promoting the work committed to him in behalf of our Church, and acknowledging thankfully his untiring zeal, his faithfulness, and marked success.

"4. Resolved, That this report herewith submitted be printed in the Journal."

I would say just one word in explanation. I have here the Commission's report, which is quite voluminous, and which I beg to present. I do not suppose it is desirable to have it read now, though I should be very glad to have the members of the House read it. It is a *résumé* of the present movement, the inner mission in the Roman Catholic Church not only in Italy, but the Old Catholic movement in Germany and Switzerland, as well as a reference to the movements of a similar character in different parts of the world, and also refers to the wonderful movement in Mexico, substantially of the same character. I should like to have this report brought to the attention of the House in some way or other, by having it read or by having it printed. I feel myself very great hesitancy in asking the attention of the House to such a long report. Perhaps it had better be printed in the Journal, so that it shall come before the Church, for it is one of the most important documents, I think, that we shall have before us at this time, and it ought to go on the records of the Church as closing up particularly what is called the Religious Reform Commission, which now ends. It is proposed under this new Commission to have no foreign paid secretary at all. Rev. Dr. Langdon's connection with this movement ceases except as he might as a foreign chaplain be in correspondence, as we expect that all foreign chaplains will be, with this Committee when it shall be organized. The movement is designed to embrace the work throughout the world, and the Joint Committee is to act rather as a bureau of correspondence for the purpose of not only having this Church advised of movements in which it would naturally be in sympathy, but, furthermore, to have an authorized channel through

which moral co-operation may be extended by this Church to movements, such as are herein described, in other religious bodies. I beg to submit the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT. Do you wish to put the resolutions on their passage now?

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I should like to have them passed and sent up to the other House.

The resolutions were read and passed.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Now, I move that the report submitted by the Committee be printed in the Journal.

The motion was agreed to.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred two resolutions relating to examinations for Deacon's Orders, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that it is inexpedient at this time to make the proposed amendments in the Canons upon Theological Education, which were so carefully perfected and adopted at the last Convention. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of increasing the requirements for admissions to the Diaconate."

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

CERTIFICATE OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. As this is the last day for introducing new business, I should like to offer this resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the certificate to be given by the Standing Committee by Title I, Canon 2, Section 3, Sub-section 6, be amended by inserting in the third line, after the word 'we,' the words 'have reason to,' and that the words 'do furthermore declare that in our opinion,' in the seventh line, be omitted, and the words 'and that' be substituted, and the word 'them' substituted for 'us' in the third line, so that the whole certificate may read:

"We, whose names are underwritten, certify that (from our personal knowledge, or from testimonials laid before them, as the case may be) we believe that A. B. is pious, sober, and honest; that he is attached to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church; that he is a Communicant in said Church in good standing; and that he possesses such qualifications as fit him for entering upon a course of preparation for the holy ministry."

This is intended to meet difficulties that sometimes arise where persons present themselves as candidates who are themselves unknown, and come, perhaps, from obscure portions of the Diocese. It will relieve the consciences of some of the Standing Committees. I move that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

EUCCHARISTIC ADORATION AND PENANCE.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I offer the following resolutions to go on the docket:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the practices commonly described under the name of Eucharistic Adoration, and the practices designated as the Sacrament of Penance, together with all teachings leading to the above-named practices, are hereby solemnly declared to be foreign to this Church.

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Prayer-

Book be requested to prepare and report to this Convention such Rubrics as may be judged by said Committee needful to the preservation of the Ritual of this Church with integrity and purity.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to ascertain whether any legislation be necessary to prohibit in public worship (commonly called Divine Service), in the Communion and Baptismal Office, in the Order of Confirmation, in the Solemnization of Matrimony, and in the Order for the Burial of the Dead, the use, by any minister or lay-reader of this Church, of any prayer, Litany, Suffrages, Thanksgiving, Exhortation, or form of Absolution, other than those contained in the Book of Common Prayer."

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I should like to ask whether this cuts off such private services at the house, in case of a funeral, as we are accustomed to have from a clergyman's companion?

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. It is merely desired that the resolutions go on the Calendar. They are not now up for discussion.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be placed on the Calendar.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS OF CHINA AND JAPAN.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Message No. 37 from the House of Bishops be made the order of the day for Tuesday next at eight o'clock P.M."

This is in regard to the Missionary Bishops of China and Japan. I do this in order that the congregation need not be dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

RUBRICS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut, from the Committee on Canons, submitted a report, which was read, as follows:

"The Committee on Canons have had under careful consideration the memorials coming from more than five hundred of the clergy of this Church and a very large number of vestries and other laymen, together with the nearly unanimous action of one of the largest Dioceses, praying for the relaxation of the Rubrics in the Office for Infant Baptism, as granted in a former age in case of the Apostles' Creed, which tended to the peace of the Church without altering its doctrine or perceptibly its practice.

"In view of the number and character of the petitioners, it is deemed reasonable at least, if not their due, that their petition should be so far responded to as to put it in the power of the next General Convention to extend the desired relief if in its judgment the best interests of the Church should so require. The Committee therefore, without being understood to pledge any of its members upon the vote thereon, do submit for the action of the House the following resolution:

"1. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be and hereby is proposed to add, as a Rubric at the end of the Office for Infant Baptism, the words following, viz.: 'The minister may, at his discretion, omit the Exhortation preceding the Lord's Prayer in the above Office, and in place of the Thanksgiving substitute the Collect for Easter Evening. This Rubric, however, is not to be construed as implying any change in the doctrine of the Church.'

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Secretary of the House of Deputies cause the proposed Rubric to be made known to the Dioceses, as required by the Constitution and Canons."

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I move that the consideration of these resolutions be made the order of the day for Tuesday, immediately after we have disposed of the order concerning the Hymnal,

and be continued the order of the day until it is decided upon.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. A special order must be for a specific hour, I respectfully suggest, because it may crowd other matters specifically appointed for certain hours.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. As far as I have been able to catch a few words, this is a very important measure; but there is so much conversation going on among gentlemen near the Chair that we cannot hear a single syllable, except to know that this is an important measure—a change in the Prayer-Book.

Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. I hope the Chair will be kind enough to order the re-reading of the report.

The report was again read.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The proposition I have made is that this report be taken up for consideration on Tuesday, immediately after the Hymnal is disposed of. We cannot fix the time because the Hymnal may very soon be disposed of or it may take more time than I think it will. We want this subject to come distinctly before the House immediately after that which is the order on Tuesday shall be disposed of.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I would suggest that this report be printed. It is a matter that touches the Prayer-Book, and therefore the members should be put in possession of it.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I accept that suggestion, and include it in my motion.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is that the report be printed, and made the order of the day for Tuesday after the disposition of the Hymnal.

The motion was agreed to.

PRAYER FOR RULERS.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I desire to offer a resolution directing a prayer for the President of the United States according to the revised prayer of 1789:

"Whereas, in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, it is stated that when in the course of Divine Providence these American States became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included; and that thereafter the attention of the Church was *first drawn to those alterations in the Liturgy* which became necessary in the prayers for our civil rulers in consequence of the Revolution. And the principal care herein was to make them conformable to what ought to be the proper end of all such prayers, *namely*, that rulers may have grace, wisdom, and understanding to execute justice and to maintain truth; and that the people may 'lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty'; and

"Whereas, this prayer, acknowledged to be the first subject of attention of the Convention of 1789, and revised in the words quoted above from the preface, has not been published in the Book of Common Prayer, but instead thereof there is now the Prayer used before the Revolution, changed only as to the title of the Rulers, 'the President of the United States' having been substituted for the King and Royal family; and,

"Whereas, none of the petitions of the revised prayer, which were justly declared to be the proper end of all such prayers, are to be found in the prayer in use, viz.: that the rulers may have grace, wisdom, and understanding to execute justice and to maintain truth; and that the people may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty, but instead thereof all petitions rejected by the revisers, and resting on no sanction or precept of Holy Scripture or of the primitive Church. Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring),

That the Prayer for the President of the United States, and all in civil authority, as set forth in the General Convention of 1789, be substituted for the prayer now in use, which would read substantially as follows:

"O Lord, our Heavenly Father, the High and Mighty Ruler of the Universe, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth, most heartily we beseech Thee to give to the President of the United States, and all others in authority, grace, wisdom, and understanding to execute justice and to maintain truth, that the people may lead quiet and peaceable lives in godliness and honesty, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

I desire to say, in explanation, that I wish this to go on the Calendar that it may come properly before the House. I have endeavored on other occasions to bring it to the notice of the House, but have never succeeded. It has been referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book, and has been reported on the last days of the session. I do not wish this now referred to the Committee on the Prayer-Book. It is not in the light of an alteration; I desire no alterations in the doctrine or in the offices of the Book of Common Prayer. My own study leads me to believe them to be scriptural and primitive, and I approve of them *ex animo*. But this is a very important matter, and if it be investigated by this House, I believe they will see that the resolution is proper and wise. It is not an alteration of the Book of Common Prayer properly so called, but is a correction. If any one will take the preface and look at what is there stated to have been the revised prayer, he will see that the correction ought to be made. This is especially a time, when there is so much violence all over the land, when this prayer should be set forth that the people may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. When it comes up for discussion, as I hope it will, I will present the reasons for it.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. Members of the Convention will remember that during our secret session I read certain answers to certain enquiries proposed. I laid those papers on the Secretary's desk, not to confide them to his custody, but for the purpose of enabling members of the Convention to examine them. The difficulty is, that the Secretary understands that they have become papers of the House. I ask permission of the House to withdraw the papers, as I feel that they properly do not belong to the House, but more properly belong to gentlemen whose names are concerned. My object in laying them on the table was not to put them in the custody of the House, but simply to enable members to consult them.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the time be extended fifteen minutes for the order of the day, so as to allow resolutions which have been accumulating during the days of the secret session to come in. This is the last day when they can be brought in without a two-thirds vote.

The PRESIDENT. The chair will put the question on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to postpone the consideration of the Calendar for fifteen minutes in order to admit resolutions.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. I now ask leave of the House to withdraw the papers to which I have alluded.

The PRESIDENT. Will the House grant leave?

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. Before that question is put, I beg to recall to the memory of the House the fact that when the first paper in

manuscript was presented, I especially put the question: "Is that paper put in possession of the House, and will it be in testimony?" I was told yes. I submit that all papers, whether in manuscript or in print, which were put before this House in testimony, became *ex necessitate* a matter of record, to which this House has a right, and to which they may refer in justification of their acts. Withdraw those papers, and we have nothing on which to fall back.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. In answer to the gentleman from Virginia, I would say that as far as I myself am concerned, if all the papers that were adduced here and every letter that was read here, were in the hands of the Secretary—

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I rise to a question of order. The rule was suspended for the purpose of introducing resolutions for reference.

The PRESIDENT. The consideration of this matter being objected to, it cannot be argued now, but the proposition must go on the Calendar.

PLACE OF NEXT SESSION.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a Committee, composed of three clergymen and three laymen, be appointed to confer with the House of Bishops, and suggest to this House an appropriate place or places for holding the next session of the General Convention."

It is impossible for us to act on this question without a conference. Several places have been mentioned; but the accommodation of so large a body of representatives, and the character of the Church, must all be considered. Hence the importance of having a Committee.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I rise to a point of order. I submit that the clerical gentleman from Alabama offered a resolution.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. That goes on the Calendar.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I ask the Secretary to report the resolution which I offered yesterday, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT. There must first be leave to take it up out of its place on the Calendar.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That is out of order. Was not the fifteen minutes given in order to introduce new business not already before us?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That in view of the advanced age of increasing infirmities of the present Presiding Bishop and the pressure of duties devolving upon him, a joint committee of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen be appointed to consider and report to this body some plan by which adequate relief can be accorded him under the circumstances."

I think this may be permitted to pass without discussion.

The PRESIDENT. There is so little time that everything had better go on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Very well.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. BLANCHARD, of Maryland, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Article 3 of the Constitution be amended by striking out all after the word 'Houses' in the tenth line of that article."

RITUAL OBSERVANCE.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I wish to offer a resolution, and I may be allowed to say that it will touch a Canon which will come before this House, I think, as the order of the day on Monday, a Canon in which I most heartily concur, which I hope will pass, and doubt not that it will. While about persons and policies we may differ, I trust on principles we shall all be agreed. The motion which I have to make is supplementary to the action which is to be consummated by this House on Monday, in case of the acceptance of that Canon, and I will read it to give light to the House before I say anything further:

"Whereas, The maintenance of sound doctrine, the promotion of a reverent and lively worship, and the preservation of peace and order, demand the exercise by this Church of that prerogative it possesses in every branch thereof, 'to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying'; and whereas, through defect of legislation in matters of ritual, or uncertainty and dispute as to provisions for the same allowed in the Protestant Episcopal Church to have the force of law, grave apology is lent both to excess and to looseness, and a serious bar is erected to even rightful improvement. Therefore

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a joint commission be appointed to examine, ascertain, and report to the next General Convention what provisions are of force, whether by Rubric or Canon, or by lawful custom, for the regulation of public worship in this Branch of His Church; and wheresoever deficiency or uncertainty shall appear in relation to the furnishings and ornaments of the sanctuary, the vestments of the clergy, and ceremonial observances, to recommend for adoption such measures to meet it as will constitute a definite, though elastic and generous, rule for future guidance and government."

Allow me to say, Mr. President, in one moment—Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. It will cut off all other resolutions.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I will say nothing, then. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLASS, of Missouri. I move that the resolution offered by the Rev. Deputy from Maryland (Dr. Leeds), which is pertinent to the report of the Committee on Canons No. 16, be printed for the information of the House.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Let me ask whether we are not making a precedent, and a dangerous precedent, to print anything that an individual may offer before it goes to a committee?

The motion to print was rejected.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I think the Chair stated that my resolution was to go on the Calendar. My motion will be to refer it to the Committee on Canons.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I gave notice yesterday of a motion to regulate our times of meeting. If there is any objection to the consideration of it, I will not now press it. The motion was, that hereafter we meet at nine o'clock in the morning and sit till five, with the usual recess, and not have evening sessions.

The PRESIDENT. It must first be ascertained whether there is any new business to be introduced, as I am told this is the last day for receiving it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Certainly, I give way.

The PRESIDENT. If there is new business to be now introduced, gentlemen will please take advantage of the opportunity.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. My resolution, relative to limiting debate, was placed on the Calendar, I find. That was without any motion made by myself or any other member on the floor; but I gave notice of the resolution, had it read, and the notice I gave was that I should offer it this morning. I would ask that the House may hear the resolution, so that we may determine whether it shall be adopted or not. We are now in the third week, and approaching the end of the ordinary time in which a convention like this continues in session. Our members are now leaving us, and by the end of this week many, many more will have left. Their engagements at home, especially among the laymen, will necessarily take them away.

My resolution is that from this time speeches on any one subject shall be limited to fifteen minutes, and that no one shall speak more than once on one subject, except (and it is a proper exception) by express leave of the House. If there is any matter which cannot be fully explained in the fifteen minutes, and the House is receiving instruction from the person who is presenting it, we know that the time will be extended. The result will be, if the speeches are left open as they are now on the great questions awaiting our action, many of them will be acted upon when a very large portion of the members have gone from here. They are matters in which we feel a great interest; they are matters, most of them, which we have all considered, and on which many of us have views that are decided. I think, therefore, if the House will permit this resolution to come up, we can at once determine whether we shall have discussion on subjects unlimited as heretofore. I ask for a vote on taking up the resolution.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolution, of which notice was given yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia, be now taken up and considered.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin, and others. I object.

The PRESIDENT. The objection amounts to nothing unless it comes from one-third of the House. The Chair will put the question.

The motion was agreed to, and the House proceeded to consider the following resolution:

"Resolved, That during the remainder of the session no Deputy shall speak on any one subject more than once, nor more than fifteen minutes at any one time, except by leave of the House expressly given."

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I now move that the resolution be adopted.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask whether the mover has any objection to the substitution of the word "question" instead of "subject"?

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. None; I think it will be the more appropriate form. I accept the amendment.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. It seems to me a very unfair business to propose that on the very gravest questions that can possibly come before any General Convention of this Church debate shall be limited to fifteen minutes, because there are members of this House who want to go home, or because the Deputies from Virginia have made up their minds upon them. The question which is to come before us on Monday is of the very gravest possible character. It is either a question of doctrine or it is a sham, and I desire to say that it seems to me eminently improper that any man who has anything on so grave a subject as the question of Ritual to present to this House, should be limited in this way when fifteen minutes is so short a time as to make it utterly impossible for him to present his views during that brief period in any clear, proper, and con-

nected way. I, therefore, for my own part, would beg of this House that they will not pass, at this present time, any measure limiting debate.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I beg leave to second with my whole heart and soul the opinion expressed by my colleague from Wisconsin. Every person that is in this House, whether clerical or lay, knows and understands that certain questions which are to come before us are of a most important kind; that they need the most distinct elucidation, and that there are gentlemen here whose minds are full of them, and who wish to speak distinctly to them. And here I may refer to the fact that in a former Convention the distinguished gentleman, my colleague, who has just made this appeal to you, was, I should say, choked off by the Convention and prevented from giving sufficient illustrations of the cause which he pleaded. I hope that this Convention will allow, until that question has been disposed of, unlimited time to any gentleman who wishes to speak in the affirmative or in the negative upon the Canon which has been brought to this House from the Committee on Canons, and which is to come before us on Monday. I think that the sense of honesty, equity, and justice which belongs to us as gentlemen, as Christians, and as Clergy and Laity in this House, will prevent any limitation of debate, at least until the question of the Canon of Ritual has been decided fully and completely by this House.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Mr. President, I fully agree with the two last speakers that this is not the time to limit debate. Not only is there the question of Ritual, but there are questions which I regard as quite as important—that relating to the Prayer-Book, the Canon on Divorce, and others—which are too important to be passed over by merely an exchange of conversation, which is all that can be done if you are to limit the debate to fifteen minutes by each speaker. I generally, when I think it my duty to speak, speak only to one point, and fifteen minutes are usually enough for me; but I know that there are brethren here whose minds are more capacious, and who can express themselves more largely and more fully upon every subject, and they require more time. I am therefore opposed to any limitation at the present time.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I rise to propose an amendment to the resolution; and that is, for "fifteen minutes," there be substituted "thirty minutes," for unless that be done a large number of men on this floor, who may desire to say something on these topics, and who may have as good a right to be heard as any others, will not have that privilege. The result will be that only a few individuals will be able to express their opinions *in extenso*. Most of us who have attempted to obtain the floor already and have been disappointed will be again disappointed.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I will accept that amendment, or I will withdraw the whole proposition if it is to give rise to a protracted debate.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I believe I have the floor. The result of the passage of this amendment will be to oblige the members of the House to study condensation, and there is no argument on any of these topics likely to be adduced here which cannot be concentrated within the space of a half hour. I venture to say that of all the speeches which have been delivered on this floor there is not one the whole thought of which might not have been delivered in one-fourth part of the time.

Rev. Dr. BERKLEY, of Missouri. The last line of the first article of the Constitution settles the question by stating that "in all business of the Convention, freedom of debate shall be allowed."

The PRESIDENT. That point has been overruled in this Convention for the last thirty years.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. My speech will be very short. Before the vote is taken—

The PRESIDENT. Let me ascertain, in the first place, whether the resolution is withdrawn, or whether the House gives leave to withdraw it.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I accepted the amendment to insert thirty minutes in the place of fifteen.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be modified.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I would say in answer to the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin [Dr. De Koven] that I am always instructed by what falls from him, and shall always be ready to extend any time that he wishes, for I know that he always speaks to the question and not unnecessarily.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I ask that the question be divided. It involves two subjects. One is the question whether we will hold that the rules of order heretofore adopted are unjust, and the other is the time to which speakers shall be confined. One part of the motion of the gentleman from Virginia is that no speaker shall be allowed to address the House on any one question or subject more than once. The rule of the House now is that he shall have the right to address the House twice. I submit that it is but simple justice that a gentleman may sometimes be permitted to reply to attacks that may have been made upon his argument. I think that rule, as it now stands, is eminently just, and I shall vote against that part of the resolution which modifies it, if I be permitted to do so, while I am in favor of the thirty minutes' limitation.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. I move that the whole matter be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. That part of the resolution which denies a speaker the right to occupy the floor twice will have to be passed by a two-thirds vote, because it repeals a rule.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I modify the resolution by withdrawing that part of it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Does not the rule say that if notice is given the day before it does not require a two-thirds vote? I understand the gentleman to have given notice yesterday.

The PRESIDENT. It is unnecessary to answer that question now, because the gentleman from Virginia has withdrawn that part of the resolution. The question is on the resolution as now amended.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The gentleman withdrew it upon the ruling of the Chair, that it required a two-thirds vote. I now ask whether it does require a two-thirds vote, he having given notice yesterday of his intention to move it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That question is not before the House.

The PRESIDENT. The point of order is not sustained. It would require a two-thirds vote if there were a week's notice.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I wish to suggest that we ought to provide, if it be practicable, that no member shall be interrupted by questions. I was compelled to make a speech yesterday of an hour, and inflict myself on the House for that length of time, when I could have said all I had to say in fifteen or twenty minutes if I had been let alone.

The PRESIDENT. I will try to take care of that for the future. The question is on the resolution as amended, to limit speakers on any question which may hereafter arise to thirty minutes each.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHAPLAINS IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Mr. ANDREWS, of Ohio, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to enquire whether, in their judgment, Chaplains in Theological Seminaries and Divinity Schools should be placed under the charge of the President or Chaplains thereof, and, if they shall deem it expedient, report a Canon thereon for the action of this House."

ABANDONMENT OF THE CHURCH.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have a resolution of the same kind to be referred to the Committee on Canons.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be instructed to enquire and report whether any change in Canon 6 of Title II. be necessary to more effectually carry out the purpose thereof."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to consider and report as to what rules, if any, should be adopted to regulate the procedure of this House in its action upon the testimonials of Bishops-elect, especially in regard to the time and manner in which charges or objections shall be received or entertained, the kind and nature of the evidence to be admitted in regard to such charges or objections, and, finally, any such rules or regulations as in their judgment would tend to secure a just, fair, and orderly examination of the matter to be determined upon by this House."

SUPPLEMENTARY DEPUTIES.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut, submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution be instructed to enquire whether an amendment to Article 2 is not necessary in order that Supplementary Deputies may rightfully be admitted to fill vacancies occurring at any session of the Convention."

DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNICANTS.

The PRESIDENT appointed as the members, on the part of the House of Deputies, of the Joint Committee, ordered by the resolution of Rev. Mr. Shipman, of Kentucky, in relation to the discipline of the laity, adopted yesterday, Rev. Mr. Shipman, of Kentucky; Rev. Dr. Stearns, of Easton; Rev. Dr. Beers, of Albany; Mr. Dawson, of Alabama; Mr. McWhorter, of Central New York, and Mr. Simpson, of Missouri.

HOURS OF SESSION.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. At the suggestion of the Chair, I yielded the floor a while ago for the purpose of allowing the introduction of new matter. I now move that our sessions shall hereafter commence at nine o'clock in the morning and terminate for the day at five, with the usual recess.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Allow me to call attention to the fact that you have fixed a very important order for Tuesday evening, at eight o'clock—the consideration of the election of a Missionary Bishop for China.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York

Then I will say "excepting Tuesday evening," so that we shall meet here at nine o'clock, and terminate the daily session at five, and have no evening session, except on Tuesday.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. It is easy for us to change the order for eight o'clock Tuesday evening to some other hour, and if that be the only obstacle in the way, I do not know why we should not immediately pass the resolution just offered. There are very important Committees that must meet in the evening; the Board of Missions must meet in the evening; and it is a weariness to the flesh to be here longer than from nine or ten o'clock in the morning until five in the afternoon, and gentlemen will be in a much better condition to transact business rapidly and properly if their physical condition is in good order. I hope the motion will prevail.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I withdraw the exception of Tuesday evening; and that order can be changed afterwards.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is that the daily sessions of the House be from nine o'clock to five, with the usual recess.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I would move an amendment to meet at nine and a-half o'clock. Committees have to meet in the morning; some of them have no other opportunity to attend to their duties.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to change the hour of meeting to half-past nine o'clock.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the resolution to meet at nine o'clock and adjourn at five, with the usual recess.

The resolution was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOP FOR CHINA.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I move that the order assigned for Tuesday evening be transferred to and made the order of the day for Wednesday, at twelve o'clock. That gets rid of the difficulty that has arisen in regard to Tuesday evening.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I call for the order of the day. That matter can come up on Monday. I ask that we now proceed with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. This motion can be passed in a moment.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. Very well.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Dr. Clark, of New Jersey, to change the order of the day for Tuesday evening to Wednesday at twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is the Calendar now in order?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the resolution No. 21 on the Calendar be taken up. It relates simply to the place of holding the next Convention. I believe we have not yet resolved to hold a permanent session, though my friend from Missouri (Rev. Dr. Berkley) suggested it. If we are not to hold a permanent session to continue for ever, we must arrange for some place to sit next. My motion is that that resolution be taken up. It will not require debate.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to take up the resolution offered this morning by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and now on the Calendar as No. 21.

The motion was not agreed to, two-thirds not voting in favor thereof.

PART OF TEXAS BECOMING MISSIONARY GROUND.

Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I wish to give notice of

a motion to reconsider, not that I suppose it to be positively necessary, but it may be. I move the reconsideration of the vote of non-concurrence this morning in the message of the House of Bishops, No. 34, and I wish my motion to remain as it is, simply to save rights.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

A message from the House of Bishops (No. 38) announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House request the appointment of a Committee of Conference on the part of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in relation to its message (No. 26), and has appointed the following as such Committee on the part of the House: The Bishops of Maryland, Rhode Island, and Louisiana, being the Standing Committee of this House on Amendments to the Constitution."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the Committee on Constitutional Amendments be the Committee of Conference on the part of this House.

The motion was agreed to.

(This message is in regard to the action of the House of Deputies this morning on Message No. 34 of the House of Bishops.)

RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH IN CANADA.

The PRESIDENT. The Calendar is the order of the day now before the House. The first business on the Calendar is the report from the Joint Special Committee on Relations with the Church in Canada.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I wish simply to say a very few words in presenting the report of the Joint Special Committee on Relations with the Church in Canada. It will be seen on the first page of the printed document that there are given the names of the Joint Committee of this House with the upper one, and also of the Committee of the Canadian Church. I have simply to say that the Canadian deputation expressed the greatest earnestness that these resolutions, if they should commend themselves to the General Convention, should be passed. I do not propose to go into any statement in regard to the several resolutions. The first concerns, I suppose, simply and only the Church of Canada. It will explain itself. The second is one touching the passing backward or forward, into Canada or from Canada, into the United States of members of our Church. That also, I think, will explain itself. The object is to place at once, as, I think, the resolution shows, the several persons going between the two countries under the care of the Church, who shall look after them and protect them from the various temptations which are laid in their way to draw them into other religious bodies, and also for their own temporal and spiritual good.

With regard to the third resolution, which also explains itself, evidence was produced before the Joint Committee that the Church on either side of the line was exposed to great damage and injury by adventurers representing themselves to be clergymen in good standing in the one Church or in the other.

The fourth resolution, offered by the Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Massachusetts, touches the matter of assigning to the Canadian Church a certain department in our pamphlet, known as "The Spirit of Missions." It was thought by the Canadian deputation that a great deal could be learned by the Church in the United States in their treatment, especially of the Indians, from the action in that particular of the Church in Canada. On the other hand they thought that a great deal could be learned from us by them in regard to that same part of our Missionary enterprise. Moreover, it was thought that it would tend to increase the zeal

in the Missionary work of both these Churches, if there were some sort of publication passing through the Churches, the two in common. This is enough on that resolution.

The fifth resolution is simply one expressing the opinion that it is desirable that this Joint Committee should continue in existence. That also explains itself.

The sixth resolution is simply with regard to the spreading of the action of the Joint Committee before the General Convention and the Provincial Synod of Canada.

Then the seventh resolution offered by the Bishop of Long Island is expressed in these words:

"That as it has been found impracticable to complete the business assigned to it, the Joint Committee ask to be continued until the next General Convention."

It was thought that between this time and the meeting of the next General Convention various matters of interest in these several particulars naturally and most surely would come up, and that, therefore, conference would be necessary in order to present these things in some proper form before that General Convention.

The document is now before the House for their action. I move that the second resolution be adopted.

The PRESIDENT. Do you ask for no action on the first resolution?

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. That, I think, concerns the Church in Canada. Will the Secretary read that?

The Secretary read the first resolution, as follows:

"Resolved, That it be recommended that it be made by the Provincial Synod of Canada the duty of all Bishops in the Canadian Church to require testimonials and letters dimissory from the Bishop of the Diocese in which a clergyman has last served, before granting such clergyman a license—if it be found that the case is not already provided for."

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I move that it be adopted. These papers were distributed at so late a moment that I was unable to look over the resolutions fully. Our action will add the force of our vote to the recommendation. I therefore move that the first resolution be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER. I now move the adoption of the second resolution in the following words:

"Resolved, That clergymen having charge of parishes and missions be requested to furnish families and individuals in their respective cures who are about to emigrate to the United States or to Canada such letters of commendation, and other information touching their character and wants, as will secure to them, upon their arrival, fraternal welcome and pastoral sympathy and care in the common fold in which they have been nurtured; and that, when practicable, duplicate letters be sent to the clergymen under whose parochial charge the person or persons immigrating may come."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The first resolution relates to the action of the Canadian Church in reference to clergymen coming from there here. I enquire of the gentleman who made this report whether we have any reciprocal action in reference to clergymen going from here there? It seems to me very ungracious that we should recommend that the Canadian Church certify the clergymen coming here, while we do not propose to certify our clergymen going there.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I think the English laws protect them in that particular, although I do not know how the matter stands.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New Jersey. It is just the

reverse: "That it be recommended that it be made by the Provincial Synod of Canada the duty of all Bishops in the Canadian Church to require testimonials and letters dimissory from the Bishop of the Diocese."

That is, the Bishops of the Church in Canada are to require testimonials from American clergymen. We now have a law requiring testimonials from all clergymen ordained by foreign Bishops.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That is satisfactory. I wanted to know if it was reciprocal.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Tennessee. I now move the adoption of the second resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I now move the adoption of the third resolution, in the following words:

"Resolved, That on the suspension or deposition of any clergyman from the ministry by a Bishop of either Church, notice of the same shall be given by the Bishop suspending or deposing said clergyman to all the other Bishops of the Church in the United States and in British North America."

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. This has the force of a Canon: "notice of the same shall be given." I suggest that it be "recommended." We cannot pass a Canon obliging our Bishops to send notice of depositions to the Canadian Bishops by a resolution simply.

The PRESIDENT. It is not a Canon; it is only a resolution.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. But it says "shall be given."

The PRESIDENT. Yes; but it is only a resolution after all.

The resolution was adopted.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I move the adoption of the fourth resolution, in the following words:

"Resolved, That until some organ for collecting and diffusing missionary information be established by the Church in Canada, it be recommended to the Board of Missions to take order that a department of the 'Spirit of Missions' be devoted to the use of the Canadian Church, under an editor to be appointed by that Church, in order that each Church may know what the other is doing to preach the Gospel to all men."

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I think it is worthy of enquiry what extent of space is to be occupied, and what expense will be involved.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I do not understand that it is to add to our expenses at all. That department will necessarily be a small one. It will tend to the circulation of the "Spirit of Missions" in Canada.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. It is only a recommendation.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Only a recommendation endorsed by this House; and the general impression is that, instead of being a loss pecuniarily to the "Spirit of Missions," it will tend very largely to its pecuniary benefit. It will increase its circulation in Canada by making it the Canadian organ of missions as well as our organ of missions.

The resolution was adopted.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I move the adoption of the fifth resolution, which is in the following words:

"Resolved, That it is desirable that this Joint Committee should continue in existence, and hold its sessions and prosecute its work during the next three years, by correspondence or otherwise, in order that such measures as have been suggested may be further matured, and reported to the General Convention and the Provincial Synod of 1877."

The resolution was adopted.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. The sixth resolution simply concerns the Committee itself relative to copies of its proceedings. That has been attended to. I move the adoption of the seventh resolution, in the following words:

"Resolved, That as it has been found impracticable to complete the business assigned to it, the Joint Committee ask to be continued until the next General Convention."

The resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolutions be adopted as a whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Allow me to ask whether it is not proper that the House of Bishops should be notified of our action on these resolutions?

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I should suppose so, as they refer to a Joint Committee. I move that a copy of the action of this House be sent to the House of Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on Canons respecting the proposed amendment to Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, of the Digest. The Committee were instructed to enquire into the propriety of amending those sections, so as to provide that the testimonials of Bishops-elect shall be sent to the several Diocesan Standing Committees, and to the several Bishops in all cases, instead of as now to the General Convention, within six months of the meeting of that body. The Committee reported the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, of the Digest."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. May I ask whether that report comes from the Committee on Canons unanimously?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Inasmuch as no member of the Committee on Canons rises to oppose the report, it may be presumed that it met the unanimous sanction of the Committee. I do not say, however, that it did.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The question having been asked whether the Committee on Canons was unanimous in this report, I respectfully beg to say that the Committee was not unanimous.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I offer a substitute for the resolution reported by the Committee:

"Resolved, That the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons in the matter of the proposed amendment of Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I, be amended by striking out all after the word 'resolved,' and inserting the following: 'That Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, Title I, be stricken out, and there be inserted instead thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. [I.] Whenever the Church in any Diocese shall have elected a Bishop, the Standing Committee of the Church in such Diocese shall, by their President or by some other person or persons specially appointed, communicate to the Standing Committees of the Church in the different Dioceses evidence of such election, together with a copy of a certificate signed by a constitutional majority of the members of the Diocesan Convention, which certificate shall be in the words following, viz.,"

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Is there any change in that testimonial?

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. No change.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Then it is not worth while to read it.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I will not read it, but will pass on.

"And if the majority number of the Standing Committees shall consent to the Consecration of such Bishop-elect, the Standing Committee of the Diocese concerned shall forward the evidence of such consent, together with other testimonials, to the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, or in case of his death to the Bishop who, according to the rules of the House of Bishops, is to preside at the next General Convention, who shall communicate the same to all the Bishops of this Church in the United States; and if a majority of the Bishops consent to the consecration, the Presiding Bishop or Bishops aforesaid, with any two Bishops, may proceed to perform the same, or any three Bishops to whom he may communicate the testimonials.

"[2.] The evidence of the consent of the different Standing Committees shall be in the words following."

That form is the same as before, and so I need not read it.

"Resolved, That the subsequent sections of the Canon be numbered to correspond."

I desire, Mr. President, in a few words, to explain this proposition, which is offered as a substitute for the resolution reported by the Committee.

An adverse report from a standing committee of this House throws the burden of proof on the friends of the measure adversely reported upon. That burden I do not think in the present case a heavy one. At any rate, I think the practical argument of the past eight or ten consecutive days of this Convention is sufficient to counterbalance any argument that may be brought forward in favor of the present arrangement. I have made my proposed modification of the present Canon as little as possible to accomplish the purpose.

Of course, if it meets the approbation of the House, it will be referred as a matter of form to the Committee on Canons to see that it is in proper shape.

In the absence of any reasons given by the Committee for the report, we are left to conjecture. I suppose it will be said that this Convention, being the grand council of the whole Church, is the proper tribunal to pass upon the credentials and qualifications of Bishops-elect. If we were disposed to grant this, nevertheless it has so many exceptions as practically to do away with the value of the rule. Even if we took it on an average, there would be five exceptions to one application of the rule. If the election of a Bishop happens within six months of the meeting of the General Convention, the testimonials are required to come before this House; but there are six times six months in the three years that intervene between two General Conventions; and therefore the application of the rule, even on the general average, would be only as one out of six—five exceptions to one application of the rule.

But there are more exceptions. The creation of every new Diocese is consummated by the General Convention, and accordingly it so happens that the first Bishop-elect of any new Diocese has his credentials, as a matter of course, sent to the Diocesan Standing Committees, so that you will see that there are more than five exceptions; probably eight or ten exceptions to one application of the rule.

But it may be said that even that one application of the rule, occurring rarely, may still serve as a regulator and a caution to the Standing Committees, and that therefore it is of value. I think we are estopped from that argument by the secrecy which we imposed on ourselves in the action of the House during the past eight or ten days. We have not allowed the discussion here to go out to the world.

The members of the Standing Committees of the Dioceses, except those few who may happen to be members of the body, have not had the benefit of them. Besides, admitting the benefit to the fullest extent, it seems to me that it is purchased at too dear a cost. It is purchased at the expense of the general legislation of the Church which is waiting for the action of this body. We have spent now nearly sixteen days of this session; but four remain to us unless we prolong the session beyond the average of the past General Conventions; and we have hardly begun the general business of the Convention. We have lost the opportunity of transacting much important business by the debate that has taken place necessarily under the circumstances, but which I think ought to be, if it can be, avoided hereafter.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we adopt this resolution and send the credentials in all cases to the Standing Committees of the Dioceses, we shall be doing a good work for the Church, we shall be allowing the General Convention to transact that business for which alone it is competent, and we shall not have that business superseded by business which can be and which is in five cases out of six, if not in eight or nine cases out of ten, transacted by the Standing Committees. I do not think it needs many words to enforce this. I hope that the other side will be presented to this House, if there is another side to the question, and that then the vote may be taken.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the reason I asked whether the Committee on Canons were unanimous was not because I believed them infallible, but because I believed that it is almost impossible in this House to pass anything when they unanimously and earnestly oppose it. They get up in all parts of the House and protest. I must confess that I am in favor strongly of this proposed Canon, if the Committee on Canons will do their duty in another respect.

The difficulty we have now is that our Canons are not in accordance with the Constitution of the Church. Whenever the Canons are made to accord with the Constitution this will be an admirable rule, for then we may rest assured that men will not be weighing the chances whether the General Convention or the Standing Committees will be most likely to pass a Bishop-elect.

I ask the attention of the House for a moment to the principle on which this Church is established. They will find that in the second article of the Constitution it is declared positively:

"The concurrence of both Orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the Convention."

There is no vote that is legal unless we can show that both orders concurred in it. Now, from some carelessness, or from some consideration relative to particular Dioceses, there are Standing Committees that are entirely unlike the Constitution of our Church. It may not be known to every Deputy in this Convention that in Connecticut and Maryland no laity are on the Standing Committees at all, and there is nothing in our Canons that would prevent every Diocese from making its Standing Committee consist wholly of laity or wholly of clergy. We have a fundamental principle, and yet we are authorizing other bodies to act in defiance of that principle. The Committee on Canons now have it before them to make the Standing Committees, so far as they act upon the business of the General Convention, to be represented as in the General Convention in fact. If they pass that Canon and we adopt it here, then I think there will be no difficulty, or ought to be none, in the adoption of this proposed Canon of the Deputy from Easton. If by our Canons we require that the Standing Committees shall comprise the needful number of

the laity and clergy, and require the concurrence of both orders to testify, I think what is now proposed would be practicable, and certainly in that case it would be more desirable than the present system. If the gentleman from Easton will accept an amendment that his resolution be sent to the Committee on Canons with instructions to frame a Canon in accordance with the principle of the Constitution in the particular which I have suggested, I am perfectly willing that his proposition shall now be passed; if not, it should be delayed until the Committee act on the proposition referred to them yesterday on my motion.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I wish to refer the matter to the Committee, with instructions to frame a Canon in accordance with the principles of the Canon I have presented. Is there anything further that the gentleman desires?

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want a Canon framed to control the Dioceses in regard to their Constitutions, and a provision as to how Standing Committees are to be organized?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I do want a Canon framed by which every agency of this Convention to do the work that belongs to the Convention shall be established upon the principle upon which the Convention acts. I know it has been contended by some extremists in the Church, though there is only one Diocese that I ever heard it from, that we have no right under our Constitution to touch the Constitution of a Diocese that preceded the Constitution of this General Convention. I remember, when that question was raised, three gentlemen from this House, whose names, if I were to give them, would be received with all respect, said in a careful report that there was nothing in that question, that the Constitution of this Church is to be obeyed by every Diocese. Why, sir, are we to allow the question of the consecration of Bishops to be decided by Standing Committee consisting merely of clergy or merely of laity? Again, suppose the Standing Committees are equally divided? How do we know that both orders concurred? Perhaps all of the laity were present and only one of the clergy, or all of the clergy and only one layman.

I think any gentleman who will examine the principle on which this Church is founded will see that we are bound, before we pass on this matter finally, to see that the Canons of the Church are made to conform to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I should have been glad if the Committee on Canons had reported in favor of the repeal of these sections; but, inasmuch as the report is otherwise, and the Committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, I am perfectly willing that that motion should be adopted, because the whole matter will be practically left to the Dioceses to decide whether they are willing to go into an election or not during the six months. We cannot direct them what they shall do in this matter; it will be for each Diocese to decide the question for itself, whether during the six months prior to the meeting of the General Convention they will take the responsibility of electing some one to be their Bishop, and send his name here and have him run the gauntlet. In every Diocese there is provision made for calling special conventions.

I therefore, without prolonging my speech, because it is unnecessary, would simply say that we may as well leave these sections, and relegate the whole matter to each Diocese to decide for itself whether it is willing to have the name of a Bishop, whom it shall elect, sent to this House on some future occasion.

Mr. BRUNE, of Maryland. I trust, sir, that the proposed change suggested by the Clerical Deputy from Easton will be adopted, and I take the liberty of speaking upon this question, because I occupy, in common with my lay colleagues from Maryland, the peculiar position of representing one of the few Dioceses (if indeed there are any more) where the Standing Committee is exclusively clerical. I wish, therefore, to raise my voice in this Convention to express the desire that hereafter the election of Bishop shall be remitted entirely to those Committees, not that I shall have, as an humble member of Maryland, any power in the matter, but to be free from it, and to let the clerical members of a committee which is entirely clerical judge of that question. What has been said by my friend from Easton is true, that we have had sad experience of the matter ever coming before this body. It can have done no good; but that is not just now the question before us. The question is, shall we have the time of this Convention taken up hereafter with such matters? Unless that is necessary for the good of the Church, I think every one of us, as a practical man, will say that our time ought not to be taken up in this way when we have a limited session for the consideration of so many very important questions. It is surely a disadvantage to us to have to consider such questions during the short time we necessarily have.

Then comes up the proposition suggested by the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey, which is a proof of the wisdom of making the general rule, that if the general rule is not adopted which is demanded, I think, by the needs of this Convention, it may be at any time practically resorted to by the will of the Diocese, which can evade the present rule in most cases by so arranging its election that the matter shall not come before the General Convention. If there be a general rule that it must come before this body as the great inquest of the Church, then we ought to have a time set apart especially for such deliberations, and I trust that hereafter they will be public when we come to deal with such questions. But when we have only three weeks to deal with all the great questions of business before this Convention, that we should have one-half of that time taken up in deliberations about the fitness of a Bishop, when that matter should be passed upon quietly and calmly and deliberately in the different Dioceses, I think is not proper.

I say that it is clear that we should follow the advice of our friend from Easton and make the general rule that we shall have no more elections of Bishops coming before this body.

One word in relation to the objection raised by the Deputy from Pennsylvania. I did not understand his constitutional objection. I believe, however, he meant to say that because there was in the Constitution a provision that when we in Convention come to vote by orders there must be a concurring vote, that rule should be applied to the voting of the Standing Committees. I say the cases are entirely different. The constitutional provision is one thing, and the mode of constituting and electing Standing Committees is prescribed and given by the different Dioceses, and they may constitute their Standing Committees as they please. This is part of our law. They are of course chosen by the vote of the laity in the Diocesan Convention, but when they sit as a committee they act by their majorities, and not by any questions of order, unless they choose to make that a part of their rules. But to apply the constitutional provision that when this House passes upon a question by orders there must be a concurrence of orders, to the matter of

the Diocesan Standing Committees, is, I say, entirely inadmissible.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, from long experience in this House, I have the impression that the Committee on Canons generally manage to represent what is the average feeling of the House when they make a report. Now, I am entirely of the opinion that the election of a Bishop, or I should rather say the confirmation of a Bishop, ought never to be brought before this General Convention; but I am also of opinion that in consequence of our recent debate here a constitutional majority of this House will be bound to vote this thing down, because, if it should happen to be passed, it would seem like a reflection upon what has been done in this Convention. Therefore they will be disposed to vote down a measure, which ought to pass upon its own merits. It would seem to me to be a very desirable thing that a measure so really deserving as this should not, at this moment, be pressed upon the attention of this House. I suppose it will pass eventually; but in the meantime I beg leave to say that, as was suggested by the Rev. Deputy from New Jersey, the matter is in the hands of the various Dioceses.

I fancy that after this no Diocese which does not mean to send up to this Convention a man who has the merit of being totally insignificant, will make the election six months before the Convention, and I beg leave to say to this House that I fancy still more that if there should be any Diocesan Convention that should elect a man who ever had said or done anything in his life which could possibly be discussed, that man would at once decline an election to any Diocese which elects him within six months of the meeting of this General Convention.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I call the gentleman to order. His remarks are a reflection on the Diocese of Wisconsin, which has sent a man here who has done something, as I understand.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I beg leave to say that the Diocese of Wisconsin did so before this General Convention met. It never imagined that this General Convention could possibly do what it has done. That is the reason why it did so.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. It simply shows that it is possible to do the thing in Wisconsin.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Mr. President, I hope the resolution to which the Committee on Canons have come will be sustained by this House, and that the Committee will be discharged from the consideration of this subject. First, because a conclusion which has been reported by a committee such as that, as was suggested by the last speaker, presumptively will meet the approbation of the House.

Now, sir, the question before us is this: shall Bishops be ratified by the vote of the House of Deputies, as the general rule, or by the action of a majority of the Standing Committees of the Dioceses? The general rule—not the exception, but the general rule—prescribed by our Canons is that all Bishops shall receive the approbation of this House.

I call the attention of gentlemen to the language of the section under consideration, which is, without exception, a general enactment that all Bishops elected by the several Dioceses shall receive the approbation of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and shall receive their testimonial. This mode of enactment shows that in the mind of those who framed our Canons, it was thought desirable that this House, representing the whole National Church, should pass upon the fitness in the particulars prescribed of every Bishop elected by a Diocese. And why? For a reason which I have listened in vain to hear mentioned even now, or during the

long eight days' discussion we have had, and a very important reason. This is the only body in the world that by its action can secure uniformity of religious belief in the heads of the Church. If the right of electing a Bishop, without any other check, was left to the several Dioceses, each Diocese might have a pastor at its head who might be holding and practising different religious rites and ceremonies and doctrines from the heads of other Dioceses. We alone can alter the Prayer-Book; we alone can alter any of the rules of practice, or prescribe or interpret the doctrines of the Church; and when our action is required to approve a Bishop it tends to give uniformity of faith and doctrine throughout all the Dioceses of this broad land.

The provision that a standing Committee may act upon this matter is the exception. It goes on to state that if by reason of there being no General Convention within six months of the election thereafter, it may go before the Standing Committees; and it is expressed in this language:

"If the Diocese electing a Bishop shall wish his consecration before the meeting of the next General Convention, they may send it to the several Diocesan Standing Committees."

Mr. President, the remark has been made here that the Dioceses have it in their power to evade this legislation and remit it in all cases to the Standing Committees of the Dioceses. Yes, sir, they have; but I am not one of those who believe that the honorable bodies which represent the several Dioceses will seek to evade any general purpose of this Church when they see by the Canons that the general rule of this Church is that this House shall pass upon every Bishop-elect, and if a vacancy occurs within six months, I do not believe they will postpone an election until some future day. If they do, it will be a plain declaration that they expect to elect a Bishop not satisfactory to a majority of the Dioceses of these United States. They will have that burden upon them at least.

I repeat that if a Diocese in which a vacancy occurs within six months of a General Convention shall vote to postpone the election of a Bishop till after the meeting of the next General Convention, it will be virtually a vote that they wish a Bishop who will not meet with the approval of all the Dioceses in the United States in General Convention. I do not believe any Diocese will wish to put itself before the Church of this nation in that attitude.

I do not believe either with the gentleman from Wisconsin, that this is a time to take action on this question. He made the most extraordinary declaration, for which, it seems to me, he was very properly called to order.

THE PRESIDENT. I hope that that declaration will not be commented upon.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I do not wish to comment upon it except as bearing on the merits. It is understood, I suppose—

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I beg leave to state that I was not called to order. The gentleman from Long Island rose to a point of order and asked me a question. And I beg leave to say, if I may say it with due respect, that it is scarcely proper for the President of this House to comment upon the speech of any gentleman on this floor.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I shall not be out of order in my comment.

THE PRESIDENT. I called the gentleman who is speaking to order, because he seemed to be approaching a certain part of Dr. De Koven's speech.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. With all due deference to the Deputy from Wisconsin, I did call him to order.

THE PRESIDENT. I do not think the gentle-

man was out of order upon the point that the Deputy from Long Island stated, but I think that he was out of order in reflecting upon the conduct of this House. The time for the recess has arrived, and the House will now take a recess until two o'clock.

The recess having expired, the session of the House was resumed.

RELIGIOUS REFORM ABROAD.

The PRESIDENT appointed Rev. Dr. Haight, of New York, Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island, Rev. Dr. Leeds, of Maryland, Rev. Dr. Fulton, of Alabama, Rev. Dr. Davies, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Ruggles, of New York, Mr. Livingston, of New York, Mr. Mason, of Massachusetts, Mr. King, of Long Island, and Mr. Parker, of New Jersey, as members of the Joint Committee on Religious Reform Abroad and the relations of the Church thereto, provided for by a resolution reported this morning by Rev. Dr. Schenck.

TO-DAY'S SESSION.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have been informed that at three o'clock to-day the use of this House will be required for preparation for Divine Service on to-morrow. I therefore move that we adjourn at three P.M.

The motion was agreed to.

SHORTENED SERVICES.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, submitted the following report, which was read:

The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed Amendment of Canon 20, Title I., "Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer, intended to provide for the use of Shortened Services," respectfully report that in connection with this matter, and also with the subject of Ritual, they have thought it expedient for them to consider the question of a general revision of the Rubrics. In the opinion of the Committee certain changes in the Rubrics seem desirable, provided they can be had without too seriously unsettling the established Liturgy. It is certainly desirable to avoid departures upon the plea of necessity from the present order of services as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

The law of the Church upon this subject is contained in Article 8 of the Constitution, which appoints the use of a Book of Common Prayer and other offices of the Church, and indicates the mode in which alone changes can be made in it, and in Canon 20, of Title I., which provides that the said Book of Common Prayer shall be used by every minister of the Church before all sermons and lectures, and upon all other occasions of public worship.

The Committee are keenly alive to the great risk attending any attempt to open the Rubrics, or any part of the Book of Common Prayer, to revision. But they submit that these evils are less than those which they desire to escape.

But your committee furthermore believe that certain changes are highly desirable on their own account, and with a view to accomplish, among others, the following results, viz.:

1. To provide shorter form of service, public and private, upon certain occasions and in certain cases.
2. To provide greater variety in the regular forms of public service.
3. To provide for the separation, when so desired, of services now commonly used in connection.
4. To remove obscurities in the present Rubric, and to supply deficiencies in the same, *e. g.*, to define, for order's sake, more accurately the postures to be observed, and the robes and ornaments to be used.

5. To secure a better Lectionary, especially for Lent.

6. To relieve the clergy, scrupulous in the observance of the Rubric, from certain hardships now resulting therefrom.

But your Committee are persuaded that these changes, with the exception perhaps of the third, cannot be safely made except in the way provided for by Article 8 of the Constitution, which requires, in order to any alterations in the Book of Common Prayer or any additions thereto, that the same be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of each Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention. They think, moreover, that the greatest caution should be used in such a work and great deliberation. And they would therefore recommend the appointment of a Joint Commission on the Revision of the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, to report to the next General Convention, to which Commission the whole subject of shortened services and the proposed Lectionary should also be committed.

With reference to the shortened forms of public worship referred to them, the Committee think that sufficient doubt rests upon the power of any one General Convention to do this by Canon, to render it inexpedient that the attempt be made, and that the matter should be either referred to the Joint Commission as aforesaid, or adopted as a separate act in this Convention, to be made known to the several Dioceses for confirmation in the next.

But your Committee do not see the same difficulty in the third measure proposed, viz.: the separation of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Office. The House of Bishops has already expressed its opinion that these services are separable, and that there is nothing in the present Rubrics to render necessary a reference of the subject to two General Conventions. They therefore recommend the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it is the sense of this Convention that nothing in the present order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others.

"Provided, That, when used together, they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used, and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Commission, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven laymen, be appointed (the Presbyters and laymen to be chosen by ballot in the House of Deputies), to take into consideration the whole subject of Rubrical revision, among other things providing shortened and more varied services, and a new Lectionary, and making such other suggestions as may seem judicious with respect to the services and offices of the Church; and to report to the next General Convention.

"By order of the Committee.

"WM. COOPER MEAD, *Chairman.*"

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I move that this report be printed, and made the order of the day for Thursday next, at twelve o'clock. I would like to move an earlier hour if it were possible, but I believe Wednesday is already assigned.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. May I ask a question? There is one matter which I do not notice as having been treated of in either of these reports upon shortened services. In the Canon of shortened services presented originally by Dr. Haight, there was a provision that sermons and lectures could be given without the ser-

vice from the Book of Common Prayer preceding them. Now that is a matter which is provided for by Canon, so that we could easily pass that, even if we could not pass the other parts of a Canon of shortened services, and I did not notice any attention having been given to it.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. That is not provided for in this report, and I suppose that belongs really to an amendment of the twentieth Canon; but at the same time I would say that we had all those shortened services under consideration, and thought upon the whole it might be better to await some general action from a commission on the subject, and not go piece-meal about it.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that this report from the Committee on Canons be printed for the use of the House, and made the order of the day for Thursday at twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I rise to a question of privilege to make a statement. An appeal was made to me to advocate the withdrawal of a paper given to the Secretary by the Clerical Deputy from Alabama (Rev. Dr. Stringfellow) because I had not placed in possession of the House papers that I had read. I will make this statement, Mr. President: I have no doubt the person from whom I got the papers I read will grant that privilege. If he does not, I am perfectly willing to move for handing those papers back now in the possession of the House. Beyond all doubt, the papers I produced will be put in possession of the House on Monday.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would ask if there is any reason why the motion should not now be made that those papers be withdrawn? I read a letter here—

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I beg leave to continue my remarks.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day is called for.

USE OF BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Is it lawful for me to introduce now an amendment to Canon 20, covering the point which has not been treated of in the reports of the Committee on Canons?

The PRESIDENT. The order for the day has been called for, and the gentleman from Western New York is on the floor. I hope you will have the opportunity before we adjourn.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN. Will the gentleman allow me to make that motion?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I have no objection to yielding the floor to the gentleman long enough to offer his resolution and put it on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I will make the following motion, and will write it out and hand it to the Secretary in a moment: that in Canon 20, of Title I, the words "before all sermons and lectures, and," and the word "other" be left out, so that the Canon will read as follows:

"Every minister shall, on all occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is, or may be, established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church; and, in performing such service, no other prayers shall be used than those prescribed by the said Book."

The only object in making the amendment is to permit persons to preach sermons, or deliver lectures, without the necessity of using the service in the Book of Common Prayer beforehand. I make that motion, and will write it out and give it to the Secretary, and have it referred to the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee on Canons, rejecting the proposed amendment of Sections 2 and 3 of Canon 1, of Title I, of the Digest, being in relation to the testimonials of Bishops-elect.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Mr. President, to resume. It is obvious that the scrutiny to be given to any person elected as a Bishop depends upon two things: First, the prominence with which he has been before the Church and the public; and secondly, the number of witnesses testifying in the matter. And right here I wish to say that in the testimonial which this House gives each person is neither judge nor juror alone, but each person is a witness who is made to say that he testifies. He testifies in the presence of Almighty God, but he does not testify as in ordinary courts of justice. He testifies on information personal to himself, if you please, as well as on information which may be communicated to the body.

I wish attention to be drawn to this matter. This House, composed of four hundred members, is convened for each member to testify to his fellows as to the person under consideration, and in giving that testimony he acts upon information necessarily; and the weight to be attached to the information is to be judged of by every member who gives his vote. Now when there are four hundred witnesses drawn from every portion of this broad land, all together testifying in the presence of Almighty God, whether they are informed that he is justly liable to be reported for error in religion or viciousness of life, it is a formidable ordeal for any gentleman to pass through, and more formidable if he is well-known throughout the length and breadth of the land. It calls for a testimonial of such a character that we may be sure from the result that we shall be right.

That is the object of it. That is the rule, and that was the only rule until by the increase of the number of Dioceses and of the number of Bishops, it became desirable, for mere convenience, that in certain cases if Dioceses wished it, they might submit the question to Diocesan bodies, to the Standing Committees, instead of to the body of the Convention.

What do we have when it is submitted to the Diocesan bodies? We have bodies composed of from five to six, or seven, or eight members, of so many different Dioceses of the United States, and they also testify personally on information in reference to this same matter. The number of persons may not be very different, but they are not representative persons necessarily. In some cases, as we are told, they are simply clergymen, and the testimony only of his fellow-Presbyters is given; the testimony of the laity is not given. I do not know but what we of the laity may be considered in one sense as those without; and the Apostle says that a man who is to be a Bishop must have a good report not only with his fellow-Presbyters, but even those without—without the Church, I suppose, at any rate, those without the presbytery—and it is very important he should have a good report as well among laymen as among clergymen; and I think that it is of great importance that he should have the good report of all men, and I think that is what the Apostle means.

When the question is submitted to the Standing Committees of the Dioceses, we all know from the nature of the human mind and of the human char-

acter that the few men composing a standing committee will not feel at liberty to act with that boldness and that freedom with which three hundred men in consultation, as we are here, will act upon any subject. Influences may be brought to bear upon them, and personal motives will sway them in a way that will not sway such a body as this.

With one more thought I shall conclude my remarks. It seems to me an intimation has been thrown out here that because of what gentlemen are pleased to call the extraordinary character of our action, for the eight days in which we were in secret session, this measure should be adopted.

The PRESIDENT. I beg that no reference will be made to the secret session.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I wish to bear my testimony, and to correct any impression that may have gone abroad, that it was the fact—and it is to the testimony of every member I have heard speak on the subject—that never in a body composed of many members, and canvassing and discussing a question involving so much feeling, was a debate conducted with more decorum, with more courtesy, with more propriety, and never was one conducted with more honor to the Church and to its members in this Convention assembled; and I may say that the more freely because I took no part in the discussion. I listened patiently to it all, to men on one side and on the other in the conflict of opinion, and I heard nothing but what was becoming to gentlemen. I wish to bear this testimony because I find it given in the papers and talked of among individuals as if it were a scandal and a backbiting; and some who are feeling bad over the result on the other side are willing to stigmatize it in that way. I am sure no member of this Convention will stigmatize our proceedings by giving them such a character, but each and every one will bear testimony to the courtesy and propriety—yes, sir, the brilliant eloquence, with which the whole matter was conducted. I could point those from without to the proceedings of this Convention not in secret session as to their character, as indicated by the full stenographic reports; but it is not necessary here. In the whole history of this Church, so far as my memory goes, there never has been an instance in which a Bishop was subjected to the severe scrutiny which we gave the recent Bishop-elect of Illinois. Not since 1844, a whole generation of man in the past, has there been any such occasion in this House. Does that furnish any argument against the practice? Have we not had Bishop on Bishop presented to this House for recommendation, and have we not passed upon them without discussion, without excitement, and without secret session? If it does happen that there will occasionally be a name presented to the House about which there may be such a difference of opinion as to call for the action we took, it is the strongest argument in the world why that name should come before such a body as this, and not go before the isolated bodies composing the Standing Committees of Dioceses. I say from what I heard on that occasion and from the result, I am fully satisfied that the Church was honored, that the highest credit was secured to the Church, in the opinion of every member of this Convention, by the manner in which the discussion was conducted. Members were brought from the remotest points of our great nation to hear all that could be said about the gentleman whose name was proposed, and they had the opportunity of hearing the highest encomiums upon his character, as well as some criticisms which did not necessarily involve his own doctrinal error, and, in all that matter, no harm has been done to any one.

I am glad to bear my testimony to the

fact that, so far as the result was concerned, it did not necessarily involve even any personal error in religion or doctrine of the candidate himself; it only involved the fact certified to by certificates, that a majority of the Dioceses in this Convention believed that he was justly liable to a report for error in religion or viciousness of life, and that might happen with the most innocent man in the world, if by accident or other cause he had been placed under circumstances which would authorize any reasonable man to draw the inference we did; that is all.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. The language of the gentleman seems to imply that Dr. Seymour was open to evil report for both error in religion and viciousness in life. I ask him whether he meant to include that?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. No, sir, there was not any intimation in this House that any viciousness of life had been charged, or that he was open to any evil report in regard to viciousness of life; and I am glad to hear that testimony also.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the time of this Convention at this late hour. I wish simply to adduce before this Convention some of the reasons which have not been alluded to.

In regard to the confirmation of Bishops in the primitive Church, the election went on as our elections do, and then it came before what was called the province; that is to say, in the immediate portion of the Roman Empire that was distinguished as a province, there was a Christian assembly, which Christian assembly was composed of Bishops and some of the Clergy and laity belonging to the cities in that province. That was the provincial assembly, and before that provincial assembly peculiarly and especially as a matter of Christian practice, universal over the Christian Church, came the confirmation of Bishops. Now, if you suppose that in this great State of New York there was a Bishop of the Church in every city, and that there was then an assembly meeting sometimes once in a year, and sometimes twice in a year, you can see the value of the scrutiny that such a body made upon the character of a Bishop-elect. They were men of the same State as we should say, in the same body, and they knew all things about the man. If there was any mistake whatsoever made by the Diocesan Council, they at once could rectify it. That was the method in which the scrutiny of the General Church in primitive times came to pass. All who look at it will say that it was a most perfect and entire method of scrutiny, because they were all members of a common church in one state assembled together.

Now, with regard to our Church we adopted the method of Standing Committees. In regard to that method, I must honestly say that it seems to me to be hardly a scrutiny at all, that in nine cases out of ten every Standing Committee acts merely on the testimonial, has no access to anything except simply that testimonial, and it is not properly a scrutiny in any shape or form which should correspond to the examination that each Bishop of the Church should have after he has passed the ordeal of an election.

Now, sir, what does this method of ours, which is objected to on this day, amount to? It simply amounts to this, that seeing we have a chance and opportunity of returning to the practice of the primitive Church once in every three years, we do it. And who are the men that brought this forward and made it a rule that in case the election of a Bishop should take place six months before the meeting of a General Convention, then we should return to the ancient practice? I find with reference to the Canon of 1832, that in that Convention they appoint-

ed a committee to examine the Canon on this subject, and to report such amendments, alterations, and changes as should be deemed most suitable by them. The men who did that were who? Bishop White, the Father of the Church; Bishop Kemper, our first Missionary Bishop; an able member of the legal profession, who is now alive, nearly at his one hundredth year, and with whose name every judge and every member of the legal profession is acquainted, and at whose name I might almost say every member of the legal profession pays homage—Horace Binney.

I do not blame the proposer of this resolution because he desires to get rid of the trouble which has come on us at this time by doing what? By casting out a primitive Christian practice which was introduced by these eminent men.

I will say myself that I had nothing to do with the debates which occupied us for nine days. I did not open my mouth in the matter; but I listened. I was very much tired and fatigued, I confess; but I recognize the Christian Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, an assembly of gentlemen and of Christians, and no word was said there to hurt the feelings of any one, or to degrade the position in which we stand as the Great Council of this Church, and I am proud of the tone of those debates and of the course of action of each and every man of the different speakers to whom I listened with a great deal of patience, but, I confess, a very great deal of tiredness. (Laughter.)

Now, I do not think that this Church is to go back. I do not think that we are to become a mere little sect. I look to the time when in every city in the Union there shall be a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, when in every State of the Union there shall be the old Provincial Council assembled once a year; and I am very unwilling, on account of my personal experience, to cast aside a remnant of primitive action, which I am satisfied has been planted there by these great men as the seed of our future growth; and therefore I hope that this Convention, in the faith of the progress of the Church, in the belief that the Christian Church in primitive times knew what they were doing, will leave this matter to stand, and be content, even in another case, to bear the tedium and difficulty of listening, for nine or ten days, to speeches by ten or twelve clergymen and laymen, whom we all esteem in this House.

Conceding that the gentlemen who have brought forward this motion simply mistake the whole matter, that they did not recognize the value of this scrutiny, that they are willing to submit it to that which, after all, is no scrutiny at all, I hope that this House will support the resolution reported to the House by the Committee on Canons. I hope they will leave this remnant of Christian practice and Christian law still upon our books, to be the seed of a still better practice than we have now, in forthcoming generations.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I rise to ask a question simply. Does a motion to lay this subject on the table carry with it the recommendation of the Committee?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. Then I make the motion that the amendment be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Easton be laid on the table.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I ask for a vote by orders.

The PRESIDENT. We cannot possibly take the vote by orders before the expiration of the time for this day's session.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. The clerical delegation from Easton demand a vote by orders

on the motion to lay on the table, because that motion disposes of the subject. If we could have a fair, square vote on the thing itself, in a full House, I would not call for a vote by orders.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I suggest to the gentleman that if the motion to lay on the table is agreed to, the question will then come up on adopting the resolution discharging the Committee. If the gentleman wishes to vote down the resolution discharging the Committee, he has the opportunity afterwards, and he can call for a vote by orders on that. If we lay this amendment on the table, the question will then recur on the original proposition, which is a resolution to adopt the report of the Committee; and if the House vote that down, then they do not adopt the report of the Committee, and a motion to refer the matter back to the Committee to report a Canon to carry out the purpose would be in order.

The PRESIDENT. If the call for a vote by Dioceses and orders is insisted upon, we shall have to postpone the subject until Monday morning.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. If the motion to lay on the table is withdrawn, I shall not insist on a vote by orders.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I move to postpone the further consideration of this question till Monday.

The PRESIDENT. That motion cannot be received unless the motion to lay on the table is withdrawn.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I do not wish to withdraw my motion.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it. There are a large number in this House in favor of the resolution, and I should like myself to hear more discussion on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I beg to suggest to the House that we compromise by agreeing that the vote on the motion to lay on the table, which is not debatable, shall be taken by orders when the question comes up for consideration on Monday, and that then the House adjourn. I desired some forty minutes ago to make a motion to pass this matter by till Monday, with the view to spend the remainder of our short time to-day in the consideration of questions on the Calendar which would excite no debate; but that has passed, and I would say to my friend from Easton that I think in this condition of our session all of us are fully prepared to decide this question without debate, and it is but just to the other orders of business that we should proceed with the Calendar. Perhaps it would be better now to adjourn. I move that the House adjourn.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House adjourned until Monday morning at nine o'clock.

SEVENTEENTH DAY.

MONDAY, October 26.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. Edward R. Atwill, of Vermont. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Archibald Beatty, of Kansas. The Benediction was pronounced by Rev. Owen P. Thackara, of Florida.

The minutes of the proceedings of Saturday last were read and approved.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I have a report which comes under the head of "unfinished business."

On pages 234 and 254 of the Journal of the last Convention the unfinished business on which I propose to report will be found. On page 234 will be found the following resolution adopted by the House:

"Whereas, The Chief Magistrate of the United States has asked for the co-operation of this Church, and of other religious bodies, in promoting the civilization of Indians by procuring for them moral and intelligent agents, by supervising their work, and by assisting those agents in training the Indians to industrial pursuits;

"And, whereas, The Domestic Committee of the Board of Missions has acceded to the request of the President of the United States so far as to nominate agents for certain tribes of Sioux and Ponca Indians;

"And, whereas, It is important that the hands of those agents should be upheld by the Churches, and that the Indians should be protected in their rights; therefore

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies appoint a Standing Committee on Indian Affairs, composed of six laymen, to operate with the Board of Missions by supervising the secular work of the agencies under their care, by procuring such civilizing agencies as the Government does not provide, and by invoking the aid of the Government, and, if need be, the assistance of the courts, in protecting the rights of the Indians."

On page 254 it will be found that the House of Bishops did concur, and the President of this House appointed as members of the Committee on Indian Affairs: Mr. William Welsh, of the Diocese of Pennsylvania; Mr. Jno. W. Andrews, of the Diocese of Ohio; Mr. Jno. W. Stevenson, of the Diocese of Kentucky; Mr. Hugh Sheffey, of the Diocese of Virginia; Mr. Benjamin Stark, of the Diocese of Connecticut; Mr. Henry W. Hayden, of the Diocese of Michigan. Mr. Hayden is absent. The other members of the Committee concur in the report which I now present.

"The Committee on Indian Affairs, appointed at the last session of the House of Deputies, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops (see pages 234 and 254 of the Journal), respectfully report, that under the authority thus given, the members of the Committee, acting together or separately, have striven to co-operate with the Board of Missions in supervising the secular work of the Indian agencies under the care of this Church. They have done much in prosecuting the civilizing agencies that are now preparing Indians to become self-supporting citizens. To many of the Indians, who have progressed in civilization, oxen and cows have been furnished, and, in one case, a flock of sheep, and the Indian women are being taught to make their own clothing, and to perform other domestic duties.

"The year following the appointment of the Committee, its chairman visited most of the Indian reservations in the care of the Church, and a hundred copies of his report are herewith transmitted for the information of Deputies, but not for entering upon the Journal.

"The consecration of the Right Rev. William Hobart Hare, D.D., as Bishop of the Missionary Jurisdiction of Niobrara, has given the greatest relief to the members of the Committee, and greatly encouraged desponding Indians by the appointment of a Bishop for them solely.

"The aid of the Government has again and again been invoked in behalf of the Indian, often successfully, whilst at other times the merciful intentions of the President have been frustrated by powerful combinations of bad men. One member of the Committee, being a member of the United States Senate, has sought, through its committees, to su-

pervise and protect the interests of the Indians, but so far he has failed in an earnest effort to obtain such legislation as would give the Indian a standing in the Federal Courts, that they might sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded. That measure of justice is now pending in the Senate, and, it is hoped, will be successful.

"We desire to record our solemn protest against all contracts made by Government officials for the sale of timber on Indian reservations against the express wishes of the Indians in whom the title of the reservation is vested, and to express the determination of the Committee, as far as practicable, to protect them in their legal rights.

"In conclusion your Committee ask the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a Committee on Indian Affairs be appointed, and the preamble and resolution passed at the last session be re-enacted."

There are, sir, many people who are sceptical of the civilization of the Indians. A large class of them have just been put to a severe test. It is well known that very few Christians go through a military campaign without being tainted in some wise. By request of the officer in charge of the Department of the Northern Missouri, quite a large band of the Santee Sioux were sent to go out as scouts with the expedition to the Black Hills. Without any suggestion, of his own free movement, General Custer sent this letter, which was handed to me yesterday afternoon at the missionary meeting by the Clerical Deputy from the District of Niobrara:

"HEADQUARTERS MIDDLE DISTRICT,
DEPARTMENT OF DAKOTA,
FORT ABRAHAM LINCOLN, D. T.,
September 10, 1874."

"Rev. S. D. Hinman, U. S. Indian Commissioner:

"MY DEAR SIR—As the services of the Santee Scouts are no longer required, they having been employed in connection with the Black Hills Expedition, and as they are about to set out on their return to their reservation, I desire to express to you, as their agent, my hearty approval of their conduct during the brief period they have been under my command. As soldiers I have found them faithful, obedient, and trustworthy, always ready to perform their duty. It gives me still greater pleasure to testify to their deportment as men. I doubt if the same number of young men belonging to the white race could be collected in any community of the same size whose moral bearing would excel, if equal, that of the Santee young men who accompanied the Black Hills Expedition. They seem to be generally free from the prevailing vices usually found among young men. As a class, they neither indulge in profanity nor strong drink.

"One pleasant incident among the many which characterized my visit to the Black Hills I now recall. It was during one of our resting days in camp. I was seated alone in my tent when suddenly as if from the rocks and forests of that beautiful region I heard the familiar 'Old Hundred' roll forth from a score or more of manly voices. Then followed the equally familiar hymn, 'Rock of Ages,' and others not less known. Cavalrymen are not noted for their hymn-singing qualities, and I stepped outside my tent to discover from whom this music came. It was from a group of Santee young men, and I shall long remember the pleasing effect produced by hearing these good old hymns, sung as I then heard them, by men, or the sons of men, who but a few years ago roamed over this country in a state of barbarous wildness. So much for the labors of Christianity and civilization, and to you, and through you to the Santees under your charge, I express my gratification that so much has been

achieved. May the good work go on, is the sincere wish of,
Yours truly,

"G. A. CUSTER,
"Brevet Major-General U. S. Army,
"Commanding District."

Mr. President, I have nothing to add. This resolution should either be adopted now or go on the Calendar. I move its adoption, and that a copy of it be sent to the House of Bishops. As they co-operated in the appointment of the Committee, they have expressed a desire to hear the report of the Committee.

Mr. MACKALL, of Easton. I move to amend the resolution so that instead of appointing a new committee, the present one be continued. I hope the gentleman will accept that amendment.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I cannot accept it, because I think you can get better men. It should be observed that this Committee has become obnoxious to the Indian Ring, and the Chairman particularly so, and there has been great doubt expressed as to his sanity. (Laughter.)

Mr. ANDREWS, of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If the Committee desire me to accept the amendment, I am willing to do so.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Easton moves to amend the resolution by providing that the former Committee be appointed.

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 39) was received from the House of Bishops, announcing the passage by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That Section 1, Canon 6, Title II., be amended to read as follows: 'If any Presbyter or Deacon shall, without availing himself of the provision of Canon 5 of the Title, abandon the Communion of this Church, by an open renunciation of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Church, or by a formal admission into any religious body not in communion with the same, or in any other way, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee of the Diocese to make certificate of the fact to the Bishop of the Diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, to the Bishop of an adjacent Diocese, which certificate shall be recorded, and shall be taken and deemed by the Ecclesiastical authority as equivalent to a renunciation of the ministry by the minister himself, and the said Bishop may then proceed to suspend for six months the Presbyter or Deacon so certified as abandoning the Communion of this Church. Notice shall be given to said minister by the said Bishop receiving the certificate, that unless he shall within six months make declaration that the facts alleged in said certificate are false, he will be deposed from the ministry of the Church.'"

Message No. 40 announced the passage of the following resolution:

"1. Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That [1] of Section 1, of Canon 2, of Title II., be amended by adding after the words 'crime or immorality,' these words following: 'and if he be presented under [1] of this Section, the Bishop may, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, at once inhibit the minister so presented from all the functions of his ministry, until trial be had and a verdict given.'"

"2. Resolved, That [5] of Section 1, of Canon 2, of Title II., be amended by striking out the words 'on being found guilty,' and inserting in their stead the words 'if he be found guilty.'"

Message No. 41 announced the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That [1] of Section 17, of Canon 13, of Title I., be amended by inserting after the words 'the House of Bishops shall' the words following: 'on the written request of twelve members of the same.'"

Message No. 42 announced the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That Clause 2, of Section 2, of Canon 13, of Title I., be amended by the substitution in place of the words 'if the House of Bishops consent,' the words following: 'If the House of Bishops by a vote of a majority of all the Bishops entitled to seats and votes in the said House consent.'"

These messages were referred to the Committee on Canons.

Message No. 43 announced the passage by the House of Bishops of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment to [4] of Section 8, of Canon 13, Title I., communicated in Message No. 28 of the House of Deputies."

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Under the instructions of the Committee on Canons, I desire to make a report in reference to the order which was reported by them a few days ago, relating to the organization of this House. It will be remembered that last week, I think, the Committee on Canons reported and recommended the adoption by the House of the order entitled "Of the Organization of the House of Deputies, and prescribing the Duties of the Secretary." Subsequently it was suggested to the Committee that a doubt might arise as to whether either House by a standing order could bind that House meeting in the next General Convention. In order to remove all doubt and difficulty upon that point, the Committee requested that this order be recommitted to them. They have now adopted, and will report to the House and recommend them to adopt, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops, a Canon providing that all rules and standing orders of each House shall be enforced until the organization of the next House, and until they be subsequently altered or amended. The report is a short one, and I ask the Secretary to read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Committee on Canon, to whom was referred a resolution in regard to the organization of this House, and who obtained leave to withdraw their report, No. 9, on that subject for amendment, respectfully report; That they have reconsidered the same, and herewith submit a copy of the standing order as proposed to be amended, and recommend the adoption of the same, and also the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That this order, as amended by the foregoing proposition, be adopted as a standing order of this House, and be printed in the Digest at the end of the Canons.

"2. Resolved, That this order, so far as applies to the election of a Vice-President, be effective from this time, and that the House proceed to the election of a Vice-President to-morrow at eleven A.M.

"3. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following clause be added to Section 1 of Canon 1 of Title III. of the Digest:

"[4.] The rules and orders of each House of the General Convention shall be in force in the ensuing General Convention until the organization thereof, and until they be amended or repealed."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I have here the order, which has already been printed in full in THE DAILY CHURCHMAN, and of course, if any member has not read it or is not sufficiently acquainted with

its contents, he can now call for the reading of it. I do not propose to have it read, unless some member of the House desires that it should be read.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Perhaps it had better be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Order (as proposed to be amended) of the Organization of the House of Deputies, and prescribing the Duties of the Secretary. (Adopted October 15, 1841; amended October 2, 1844, October 9, 1874, and October —, 1874.)

"Section 1. At the time and place appointed for the meeting of the General Convention, the Secretary, or, in his absence, the Assistant Secretary, or, in the absence of both, the person appointed as hereinafter provided by the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the General Convention is to meet, shall call to order the members present of the House of Deputies, and record the names of those whose testimonials in due form shall have been presented to him, which record shall be *prima facie* evidence that the persons whose names are therein recorded are entitled to seats in the House of Deputies. If there be a quorum present, by the record, the Secretary shall so declare, and the House shall proceed to organize by the election by ballot of a President from the members of the House, and of a Secretary; and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. So soon as the President and Secretary have been elected the House shall at once proceed to the election of a Vice-President, by ballot; and a majority of all the votes cast shall be necessary to an election. The Vice-President on being elected may take his seat by the President, to aid him in the discharge of his duties; and he shall preside in the absence of the President from the chair. But the President shall appoint all committees, unless the House shall otherwise order. Before proceeding to other business a committee shall be appointed to wait upon the House of Bishops, and inform them of the organization of the House of Deputies and its readiness to proceed to business.

"The Secretary shall keep full minutes of the proceedings of the House; transcribe them with all reports into a book provided for that purpose; preserve the Journal and records of the House; deliver them to his successor, and perform such other duties as may be directed or assigned to him by the House. He may, with the approbation of the House, appoint an Assistant Secretary, and the Secretary and Assistant Secretary shall continue in office until the organization of the next Convention, and until their successors be chosen. If, during the recess of the General Convention, a vacancy should occur in the office of Secretary, the duties thereof shall devolve upon the Assistant Secretary, if there be one; if not, or if the Assistant Secretary shall die or resign, a Secretary shall be appointed by the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the next General Convention is to meet.

"Sec. 2. In order to aid the Secretary in preparing the list specified in the preceding section, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese to forward to him as soon as may be practicable a copy of the Journal of the Diocesan Convention, together with a certified copy of the testimonials of members aforesaid. He shall also forward a duplicate copy of such testimonials to the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which the next General Convention is to meet.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the House of Deputies and the Treasurer of the Convention, although not returned as Deputies to the Convention, shall be entitled to seats upon the floor of the House, and, with the approval of the President, to speak on the subjects of their respective offices."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. If members of the House will turn to the first page of the Journal

of the last General Convention, they will see under what standing order the House has heretofore organized. They will observe that in it there is no direct provision for the election of a President. I ask that the action of the House be now taken on the three resolutions reported from the Committee on Canons. The first is the adoption of the order. Will the Chair put the question on that?

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the first resolution reported.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I wish to propose a slight amendment to that. Where it provides for the appointment of a Vice-President by ballot, I would add after "ballot" the words "but if there be but one nomination, the ballot may be dispensed with," which may save a great deal of trouble.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I will answer the gentleman by saying that that came before the Committee, and after due deliberation they concluded that it was better not to have a *viva voce* election under any circumstances, but that the sense of the House could always be better obtained by having a ballot, and that the little time lost in taking the ballot would be justified by the result.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I withdraw the amendment.

The first resolution was adopted.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The second resolution is—

"That this order, so far as it provides for the election of a Vice-President, be effective from this time, and that the House proceed to the election of a Vice-President to-morrow, Tuesday, at eleven A.M."

In regard to that, I am authorized to state, by our Presiding Officer, that it meets with his most hearty approval, and that he is very desirous of being relieved from the weighty duties which have been imposed upon him, and which will be imposed upon him for the remainder of this session, by the election of a Vice-President, to aid him in their performance.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. One question. Will that Vice-President be a layman?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Yes, sir, the President or Vice-President may either be a layman.

The second resolution was adopted.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The third resolution is:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following clause be added to Section 1, Canon 1, of Title III., of the Digest:

"[4.] The rules and orders of each House of the General Convention shall be in force in the ensuing General Convention until the organization thereof, and until they be amended or repealed."

The resolution was agreed to.

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. I ask leave to introduce a resolution that I think will give rise to no debate whatever. It is in reference to a proper observance of the Centenary of American Independence. I understand some action has been or will be taken in the House of Bishops. I offer this resolution, with the consent of the House, bearing on that point:

"Whereas, By an act of the Congress of the United States provision has been made for the due celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, in the year 1876, in the city of Philadelphia, where that Declaration was originally published to the world, and where it is right and proper that all the people of the land should, directly or indirectly, take part therein, because all share in the blessings and privileges

which, as its consequence, followed that memorable event; and,

"Whereas, Amongst those blessings and privileges, religious liberty is of inexpressible value, and has been most fruitful in the opportunity for the development of spiritual life among the American people. Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to appoint such services and observances for that occasion as may in its godly judgment be best adapted to revive among the people of the Protestant Episcopal Church a lively and grateful remembrance of the men whose trials, sacrifices, and noble works brought into being the United States of America, and secured to the Church of God the goodly heritage that it here enjoys.

"Resolved, That the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America are hereby exhorted, in their several spheres and in all becoming ways, to exhibit their sense of the personal advantages derived from the blessings of civil and religious liberty as enjoyed by them, by promoting according to their opportunities the success of the centennial celebration of the Declaration of Independence, and to give to the same in their respective parishes and Dioceses a public recognition of the grace and goodness of God in securing with the civil the ecclesiastical independence of our land."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I presume no one will object to it in that form.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. It ought not to lead to discussion.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I want to move the indefinite postponement of this resolution. That is my motion. I move that the resolution, just brought up by the gentleman from Pittsburgh, be indefinitely postponed; and I would like, as a motion for indefinite postponement is capable of debate and discussion, to be allowed by this House to give my reasons for it.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. Does not this go on the Calendar?

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. I hope the Secretary will read the resolutions again so that the House may understand them.

The PRESIDENT. Any resolution objected to must go on the Calendar and come up in its place.

CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

The SECRETARY. I wish to present a letter which I have received from the Convocation of Canterbury.

"THE VICARAGE, ALTON, STAFFORDSHIRE, }
"September 18, 1874. }

"TO THE REV. W. S. PERRY, D.D., SECRETARY TO THE GENERAL CONVENTION:

"It was ordered by the lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, February 15, 1870, that the Prolocutor should be authorized to send copies of the 'Chronicle of Convocation' to the General Convention of the American Church and other synodical assemblies at his discretion.

"In accordance with this vote the Venerable Prolocutor has commissioned me to forward the 'Chronicles of Convocation,' containing the whole record of the proceedings of the last Convocation, to yourself as Secretary, to be by you duly presented to the General Convention.

"I have the greatest pleasure in carrying out his request, and I trust that the action of the Lower House in this matter may be taken as a token of brotherly feeling and Churchman-like sympathy by the members of the General Convention.

"Humbly praying that the guidance of the Incarnate Wisdom may be with your deliberations, and

prosper them to His glory, I have the honor to be,
Rev. and dear Sir,

"Your faithful brother,
"WILLIAM FRASER,
"Proc. Cler. Dioc. Lichfield."

The several volumes of the Chronicle not having reached me by mail, I take the liberty of showing that they are, a copy having been forwarded from a brother clergyman for that purpose.

I have also the following communication:

"SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF
"THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS,
"20 Duke Street, Westminster, s.w.,
"9 June, 1874.

"MY DEAR SIR: I am desired by the Standing Committee to offer, through you, to the General Convention of the American Church our most cordial thanks for three volumes of Historical Collections, relating to Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, which have arrived with an inscription informing us that they are the gift of the General Convention.

"The intrinsic value of the documents to all who find pleasure and profit in watching the early trials and growth, under God's blessing, of a branch of the Church of Christ is very great indeed. Future generations will have reason to be grateful to those who have preserved and handed down so instructive a record; and the work of your printers is admirable for its accuracy and beauty. We in England have a special reason for satisfaction in that we are freed from much of the anxiety with which many of these papers were regarded, so long as they remained in manuscript only, and in our custody.

"I trust that you may be enabled to complete your useful but extensive task in editing the remaining volumes.

"I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully,
"W. T. BULLOCK.

"REV. DR. W. S. PERRY,
"Sec. of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, }
"Geneva, New York, U. S."

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I rise to a point of order. I do not know whether it is too late to make it; if it is not, I rise to this point of order: that the resolutions introduced by the Deputy from Pittsburg (Rev. Mr. Getz) cannot be entered upon the Calendar, being new matter, which is excluded by an order of this House.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburg. I think the consent of the House was asked to the introduction of the resolutions, and consent was given.

The PRESIDENT. I did not hear any consent.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburg. I stated what the proposition was, and asked consent to offer it. I stated the substance of the paper before I offered it, and consent was given from the fact that there was no opposition to the introduction of the resolutions. I did not hear a single voice in opposition to the introduction of the resolutions.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I think there would have been large opposition had the contents been made known.

The PRESIDENT. So do I. I should have opposed it myself for one.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. What disposition has been made of my point of order?

The PRESIDENT. I have not made any as yet.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. If there is any doubt about the reception of the resolutions, I move a reconsideration of the question.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburg. Allow me to suggest that that is entirely out of order. The measure has already been entered on the Calendar by

order of the Chair, as I understand. I do not think it is possible for the House to go back.

The PRESIDENT. It was a misapprehension on the part of the Chair. I had forgotten that it was too late to introduce new matter.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. Not only so; but this resolution asks the concurrence of the House of Bishops. It is certainly new matter, and cannot be entered upon the Calendar of the House now.

The PRESIDENT. I think on that state of facts it cannot be introduced without a vote of two-thirds of the members present. There was no vote taken on it at all, and of course all that proceeded without that vote is null and void.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburg. I hope, then, that a vote may be taken. I am very well satisfied that two-thirds of the House or more will agree to the introduction of the resolutions. I can see no possible objection to their introduction.

The PRESIDENT. That would itself be a motion which would either have to be debated or lie over. The motion must lie over until to-morrow.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Is it not necessary that we should take that vote whether it will be entertained at all? The vote should be taken at the time it is to be introduced as to whether it can be entertained at all.

The PRESIDENT. That will lead to the necessity of having a debate on the resolution, contrary to the order which says that any resolution which is objected to must lie over until the next day.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. My point is whether it is in order to introduce a resolution at all, whether it is before the House to lie over, unless it is received by the House. Under that rule of order, we must, by a two-thirds vote, consent to admit the motion, or else it cannot be entered on the journal at all.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Unless there is a motion to suspend the rule to introduce a resolution, it is entirely irregular.

The PRESIDENT. That is true.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I call for the order of the day.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburg. I understand the Chair has decided that the matter of my resolutions shall lie over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair has so decided.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. At the request of Rev. Dr. Shelton, Chairman of the Committee on the General Theological Seminary, I present and read this report:

"The Committee on the General Theological Seminary, to whom was referred the Board of Trustees for the past three years, respectfully report: That having carefully examined the same they are gratified to find the institution in an unusually prosperous condition. The number of students in 1872 was 78; in 1873, 70; in 1874, 73. The buildings and grounds were never in a better condition than at present. Gas has been introduced into all the rooms in both buildings. Two stories of the west wing of the west building have been converted into a spacious, well-lighted, and nearly fire-proof department for the reception of the Seminary's large and valuable collection of books, the third story being reserved exclusively for pamphlets and papers. A new chapel, arranged after the models of the chapels in the colleges of the English universities, has also been fitted up in the east building. These much-needed improvements have cost \$9,000, of which amount over \$5,000 were contributed by trustees, and other friends of the institution, in response to an appeal made by the acting Dean, the Rev. Prof. Seymour. The finances of the institution seem to be slowly

but steadily improving; but the Committee are sorry to report that the professors, in the discharge of their arduous and important duties, are serving the Church on salaries utterly insufficient for their proper support. The trustees, in their triennial report, truly say:

"One thing is earnestly to be desired, and this is in the power of the members of the Church to supply, namely; adequate provision for the support of the professors of the institution.

"Your Committee call attention to this matter in the hope that a large number of the Dioceses may be led to make an annual contribution through their several rectors to the funds of this great theological school of the Church, which has already sent forth eight hundred well-trained men into the ranks of the sacred ministry.

"The Committee further report that they have prepared the accompanying list of Clerical and Lay Trustees, which after being passed upon by this House is to be sent to the House of Bishops for its approval. This list has been compiled from the list prefixed to the proceedings of the Board of Trustees, from Convention journals, and from Canonical certificates received from the following twenty-nine Dioceses: Alabama, Albany, California, Central New York, Central Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Western New York, and Wisconsin.

"The Committee report the following resolution and recommend its adoption:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Trustees named in the accompanying list be confirmed as members of the Board of the General Theological Seminary for the next three years."

With the permission of the House, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution in order that this list may go up at once to the House of Bishops.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I should like to know whether the Committee have any report of the number of times the Trustees have attended, or whether they can inform the House how many of these Trustees have regularly attended, and how many have not. I think we should then vote intelligently. We have heard quite a number of complaints about the Theological Seminary, and I hold that our agents, the Trustees to whom we confided it, are the parties in fault, if there be any fault—they who have the appointment of the professors and the oversight of the whole institution. Surely, if there is any censure, it rests upon them. I should be very glad for one to know whether the Committee has ascertained how many of these trustees have attended regularly, and how many have not, or whether they have just taken the names of those who are on the list which will be handed down from generation to generation without their appearing.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. If any information be desired, I will simply say that it is not possible for the Committee of this House to go into that matter. Under one of our Canons, each Diocesan Convention sends a certified list, giving the names which it has nominated to this Convention under the Constitution of the Seminary. Under the Constitution of the Seminary, each Diocese has a right to nominate its quota of Trustees. We cannot go beyond the certificates. The Dioceses exercise the constitutional right of selecting. I would also say that it is impossible for me or any member of the Committee to answer the question as to the number of times the Trustees thus nominated have attended. It cannot be ascertained without going through all the published proceedings of the Board.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Then I understand that the responsibility is upon us. The appointing power is upon us, but virtually we do nothing but pass upon the names they send to us. If that is the desire of the House, I have nothing to say.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. As a member of this Committee, I would answer the question of my friend from Pennsylvania, that neither this Convention nor the Committee has anything to do with regard to the qualifications of those who are nominated as members of the Board of Trustees. They are nominated by the Dioceses; and if my friend, who I am sure is very active in Pennsylvania, in its Convention, will ascertain whether those nominated from his Diocese are proper persons, and will perform his duty in that respect, and others also will do their duty under his instructions in the various Conventions, things will go on well. But neither this General Convention nor this Committee, acting under its instructions, have any right to go outside the testimonials sent from the various Dioceses.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Now I understand that it is a mere formal act of ours to see whether the certificates be right. Though the responsibility rests on us, we merely take up the names that are sent up and never reject any. If that is the understanding, we shall have to look elsewhere for the responsibility. Then the General Convention has no responsibility at all.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I may have misunderstood the report and the resolution, as read by the Rev. Deputy from New Jersey; but I understood him to say that this list was made up in two several manners: that from a certain number of Dioceses they had received certificates, and from other Dioceses they had consulted Convention reports. Did I rightly understand him?

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. Yes, sir, the journals of the last Convention.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I read Canon 4, which says:

"It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese to forward to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, at every General Convention, a certificate of the nomination by the Diocese of a trustee or trustees for the General Theological Seminary; and without such certificate the nomination shall not be confirmed."

If, therefore, some of these nominations are without the certificate, they ought to be excluded from our action by the Canon on that subject. I move, therefore, the recommitment of this report to the Committee.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was agreed to.

NIGHT SESSIONS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I think it stands on our minutes that we shall have night sessions this week; and although we changed the hours of meeting on Saturday, we did not formally repeal the order as to night sessions. I move its repeal.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The Calendar is now in order.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The House of Bishops are exceedingly anxious that a committee be appointed to determine the place for the meeting of the next Convention. I wish to call up that resolution from the Calendar. It is simply a resolution calling for the appointment of a Committee to confer. It is business No. 21 on the Calendar.

The resolution was taken from the Calendar, as follows:

"Resolved, That a committee, composed of three clergymen and three laymen, be appointed to confer with the House of Bishops, and suggest to this House an appropriate place or places for holding the next session of the General Convention."

The SECRETARY. I suggest a change in the form. The House of Bishops took exception to the last message I took up to them. It should be, "the House of Bishops concurring, That a committee," etc.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I will so alter the resolution.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. When we adjourned on Saturday the motion before the House was to lay the substitute of the gentleman from Easton (Rev. Dr. Stearns) on the table, and a vote, by Dioceses or orders, was called for. Now, I beg leave to suggest to the House and to the Clerical Deputy from Delaware who made the motion to lay on the table, that the vote be taken now directly on the substitute, with the understanding that there shall be no debate. I would suggest, therefore, that the Deputy from Delaware ask leave to withdraw his motion to lay on the table, with the understanding that instead thereof a direct vote shall be taken on the proposition of the gentleman from Easton by Dioceses and orders. I think it will be more expeditious. In case the motion to lay on the table should be lost, we should be liable to debate on the original proposition. I hope leave will be given to withdraw the motion to lay on the table, and ask the House to vote at once on the substitute of the gentleman from Easton.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. If the house will allow me consent, I will state the reasons why I made the motion and why I propose now to withdraw it. I will say what I have to say in two minutes.

The PRESIDENT. Is the motion to lay on the table withdrawn?

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I am going to withdraw it, but I ask the courtesy of the House to state why I made the motion and why I withdraw it. If they object I will say nothing. ["Go on."]

I made the motion, in the first place, to stop a long, tedious, and unprofitable discussion at this late hour of our session, when every moment is precious and immensely valuable. I made the motion because I thought this House would never give up its power and authority in reference to the confirmation or anti-confirmation of any Bishop whose name might be sent up here for action. I made the motion also because the measure looked like a reflection on the action of the House in reference to a matter which has been before them in secret session. It seemed to be a motion to prevent any Convention acting in a similar manner in the future; and I felt that this Convention ought never, under any circumstances, to yield their power and authority in reference to the confirmation of any Bishop whose name might come before it; for I look upon their action as necessary to preserve the dignity and purity and the honor of this Church.

Now, sir, I withdraw the motion to lay on the table; and I do it cheerfully, provided the House will come to a direct vote on the question, and thus settle a long and tedious and unprofitable discussion.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. If the motion is withdrawn, I have just one word to say.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I withdraw the motion provided the House will come to a direct vote.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I will only say a word in response to what the gentleman has said. The gentleman said that he made the motion because the proposition seemed to be introduced as a reflection on the action of the Convention. I wish simply to say that this motion of mine was introduced on the fourth day of the session, and was made the order of the day for last Friday week, but was necessarily postponed by the secret session. It could, therefore, have no reference whatever to the action of the House on a certain question.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute for the report of the Committee on Canons, offered by the gentleman from Easton [Rev. Dr. STEARNS]. Do you wish to hear the substitute and the report read? ["Yes."]

The Secretary read the report and the substitute of the Rev. Dr. Stearns.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I trust the matter will not be voted upon until the resolution of the Deputy from Pennsylvania [Mr. Welsh] has been acted on, by which all the Standing Committees shall be composed of clergymen and laymen in equal parts; otherwise we give away a principle which the Constitution contains.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. That is a subject which has nothing to do with this whatever. That affects present action of the Standing Committees as much as future action. It has nothing to do with the particular amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute proposed by the Rev. Deputy from Easton. I understand that the question has been ordered to be taken by Dioceses and Orders.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. That call was withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT. I understood the agreement was that the main question was to be taken by Dioceses and orders, instead of the question to lay on the table.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. The gentleman from Easton asked that the vote on my motion be taken by orders. I withdrew my motion, and that call falls.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. This is an important measure, and should not be too hastily passed on. What does it amount to? Who first confirmed the Bishop after a Diocese had elected him? The General Convention first did it; and how came the Standing Committees in any way to be implicated in the necessity to act? It was solely for the purpose of preventing the inconvenience of Dioceses being without Bishops during the greater part of the three years. The General Convention sits so as to allow action during at least one-sixth of the time, and I hold that it is wise that it should do so. It trenches not the least on the Dioceses. If a Diocese wishes a Bishop at any time before the six months, all it has to do is to elect him, and then the Standing Committees act. But now, forsooth, because the Convention has recently acted on such an election, and has been delayed for several days, gentlemen wish to throw the whole matter on the Standing Committees. Let me say to the laity that there are Standing Committees in this Church which have not a layman on them. Gentlemen of the laity, are you going to be deprived of your right, and throw this matter on such Standing Committees? There may be but one or two of them; but the principle is the same. I hold that it is wise to act now upon the rule *obsta principiis*. Let us stick to what we have until at least we provide that our Standing Committees shall be composed of an equal number of clerics and laics. Until

then there is nothing like equality among us. There ought to be, and the Constitution contemplates that there should be.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I renew the call for a vote by Dioceses and orders.

The PRESIDENT. Does the Diocese of Long Island call for it?

Mr. KING, of Long Island. We all agree in the Diocese of Long Island on that point.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I should be glad to hear the question distinctly stated by the Chair as it will be presented for the vote of the House.

The PRESIDENT. Dr. Perry will state it so that it can be more certainly heard.

The SECRETARY. The Rev. Dr. Stearns has proposed an amendment to the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons in their Report No. 7. That amendment strikes out Sections 2 and 3, of Canon 13, of Title I., and removes the provision whereby the confirmation of a Bishop, elected within six months of the time of the meeting of a General Convention, comes before that General Convention. It remains the whole matter to the Standing Committees in all cases whatsoever.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I trust, sir, that this amendment will not prevail, and I shall very briefly give the reasons that to my mind are conclusive as to that point. I consider this—

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. Is this question debatable after the vote by Dioceses has been called for?

The PRESIDENT. I think so.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. There was an understanding that it should not be debated.

The PRESIDENT. I cannot recognize a mere understanding.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I consider the adoption of this proposition as parting with a principle which ought, by no means, be sacrificed. The provision giving the power to the Bishop and Standing Committee to act during the recess of the Convention was a matter of convenience. It has been stated and proved upon this floor that a portion of these standing committees are not constitutionally organized. They are totally at variance with the Constitution of the Church, and that point alone, in my opinion, is conclusive that we should still retain the principle, even if we practically have not the power to apply it. Although the practical exercise of our power may be evaded by a Diocese not electing a Bishop within six months of the meeting of the General Convention, I would not give up the principle; and especially I would not give it up until those Dioceses who have not conformed to the General Constitution of the Church have organized themselves upon a proper platform. To speak after a civil manner, they have not a republican form of Government, for the lay element in some of them is not introduced.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. Mr. President, I was perfectly willing that the vote should have been taken without any discussion; but as the debate has recommenced, I beg leave to speak for five minutes. Everything I have to say in favor of the amendment can be said in that time.

As a member of the Committee on Canons, I voted against the report which has been submitted to the House. All the objections that have been urged against this measure apply to five-sixths of the Bishops. If it is a good reason, it ought to have prevailed heretofore in all cases. I have all the time been in favor of that great principle that equality is equity. If you apply it to five Bishops, why not apply it to the sixth? This Convention holds its meeting but once every three years; and in view of the numbers of this House, if there should be two or three Bishops

elected within six months of its meeting, and we have a debate of eight days in each case, we should have to give up all other business. If we encounter the difficulty which we have had at this session in regard to the nomination of the Bishop-elect of Illinois, and if we have three or four cases of that kind coming before us, we should have to abandon all our rights as legislators and confine ourselves to the confirmation of Bishops-elect. But my great reason is that all that can be said against the practice which is proposed applies now to five cases out of six; and equality is equity.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I do not desire to debate the subject; but supposing that we are going to take the vote, I wish to state that I hope every member of the House understands the issue as it will be presented now. The amendment, as I understand it, and as I believe the case is, proposes to change the present order, and give up the election in the six months that are retained for this House, so that all who vote "aye" when the call is made vote in favor of the change, while all who vote "nay" vote to leave things as they now are.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the substitute for the report of the Committee on Canons, proposed by the gentleman from Easton.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, with the following result:

CLERICAL VOTE.—*Aye*—Albany, Arkansas, California, Central New York, Easton, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina. *Nay*—Central Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin. *Divided*—Alabama, Illinois, Iowa, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I think it is not necessary to consume the time of the House by taking the vote of the laity. The proposition is so entirely defeated that I do not see the necessity of going further.

The PRESIDENT. I do not see how that can be done.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I desire information. I ask whether this vote is only to let it go to the Committee on Canons that they may consider it?

The PRESIDENT. No; it is to change the Canons of the Church in regard to the confirmation of a Bishop-elect.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. A final act.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. This is out of order. Go on with the call.

The Secretary continued the calling of the roll of the laity, with the following result:

LAY VOTE.—*Aye*—Alabama, Albany, Easton, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina. *Nay*—California, Central New York, Central Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin. *Divided*—Tennessee.

RESULT.—*Clerical Vote*—41 Dioceses represented: ayes 10, nays 25, divided 6. *Lay Vote*—36 Dioceses represented: ayes 9, nays 26, divided 1.

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the resolution reported by the Committee to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Mr. BARTHOLOW, of Kansas. I offer the following substitute for the report of the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That in case of the election of a Bishop by any Diocese six months prior to the sitting of the General Convention of this Church, its standing Committee shall transmit to the Bishop and Standing Committee of each Diocese a copy of all proceedings bearing on such election, together with the evidence of their approbation of the testimonials and certificates; and testimonials, as required by Canon 13, be submitted to the General Convention, and it shall be the duty of the Bishop or Standing Committee, as aforesaid, to cause the preceding testimonials, etc., to be transmitted, as provided herein, before the several Diocesan Conventions next succeeding, for their approval."

I desire merely to say that, as a member once of a convention that elected a Bishop, I saw the necessity of knowing the several candidates who were brought before the Convention. I did not know that any of the candidates were known to other members; they were not to myself. I was in great difficulty as to making up my mind whom to vote for, because I had no one to consult with. Finally, I found that there was one person in the Convention who knew probably all the candidates who were proposed. I approached him on the subject. He was unwilling to give an opinion. I named over the several candidates, one or two of whom I knew something of by reputation. He thought they would not accept if elected. I then named to him another whom he seemed to know, and he thought he would accept. I tried to get his views of this candidate. He declined to give his opinions; but I gathered from the conversation which passed that he had every confidence in the person. He was finally elected. As a member of that Convention, probably a word from me would have avoided all difficulty. He is now with us; he is entirely acceptable; but it has occurred to me, suppose something had transpired which was unknown to the person of whom I inquired. I think it is important that, in case of the election of a Bishop hereafter, we have an opportunity to discuss his qualifications; and if the Diocesan Conventions have six months to think of the matter, in my judgment, it will be better. Hence I have offered this proposition.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the resolution discharging the Committee on Canons.

The resolution was agreed to.

PLACE OF MEETING.

The PRESIDENT appointed as the Committee of Conference on the part of the House of Deputies, in regard to the place of meeting of the next General Convention, Rev. Dr. Davies, of Pennsylvania; Rev. Dr. Lambert, of Massachusetts; Rev. Dr. Cady, of New York; Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Mason, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Brune, of Maryland.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEPUTY.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported that due evidence had been presented of the appointment of Rev. J. H. Knowles as Supplementary Deputy from the Diocese of Illinois in place of Rev. Clinton Locke, D.D., who has withdrawn from the House by leave.

TRANSLATION OF BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I have a long report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and I will simply state its contents that it may go from us to the Committee on Canons.

We are asked if it is necessary to change the Constitution in order to translate a Bishop from one Diocese to another. The answer of a majority of the Committee is that it is not necessary; that the word "proper" signifies simply that one Bishop shall not interfere with the Diocese of another, but shall be kept to his own one Diocese, for which he is consecrated. A minority of the Committee have differed, and have kindly signed simply the fact of that difference, and not the adoption of an argument. The resolution appended to the report is:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Constitutional Amendments be discharged."

The report then goes to the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is that the Committee on Constitutional Amendments be discharged.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Now I move that the resolutions, which have been considered by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, on that subject be referred to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I wish to take from the Calendar the resolution offered on Saturday for the relief of the Presiding Bishop, that it may be put on its passage, inasmuch as it calls for the appointment of a joint committee with the House of Bishops; and if it is not done now it may not be reached. I move that it be taken up.

The motion was agreed to; and the House proceeded to consider the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring). That in view of the advanced age and increasing infirmities of the present Presiding Bishop and the pressure of duties devolving upon him, a joint committee of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen, be appointed to consider and report to this body some plan by which adequate relief can be accorded him under the circumstances."

The resolution was adopted, and Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island, Rev. Dr. Tucker, of Albany, Rev. Mr. Leverett, of Central Pennsylvania, Mr. Garthwaite, of New Jersey, Mr. Whittle, of Georgia, and Mr. Blair, of Maryland, were appointed the Committee.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President—Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Before Dr. Fulton begins his remarks, I move that the rule limiting debate to thirty minutes be suspended so far as he is concerned, inasmuch as he represents the Committee on Canons in introducing this Canon to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CANON ON RITUAL.

The House proceeded to consider the Canon reported from the Committee on Canons relative to Ritual.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, for years past there has been over the length and breadth of the United States a great excitement of public opinion touching the ecclesiastical matters which pertain to our own household of the faith. It has been no slight evidence of the power which this Church exercises upon all sorts and conditions of men, that while other bodies might divide, might split into fragments and go hither and thither with no force at all except what seemed to be centrifugal, our Church has been before the public constantly a topic of discussion; constantly before the public as representing this fact, that whatever centrifugal influences it may include, the centripetal is stronger than all. And yet, sir, the matters in ques-

tion have not been unimportant matters. There has been a deep-seated feeling of uneasiness in the Church itself; so that the eyes of the whole Church have been fastened upon this present assembly which was approaching to see what we should do concerning the question of Ritual, about which we were expected judicially to pronounce. Shortly after the meeting of the Convention, before the real business began, the evidence of anxiety was very manifest in the deluge of petitions and other documents which was poured in upon us; documents of vast variety; documents of vast particularity in definition; documents, however, which indicated great study, and certainly documents which indicated much anxiety; and yet it did seem as if all this dread and anxiety and excitement were somewhat disproportioned to the facts of the case.

When we looked over the whole length and breadth of the country, and saw that the actual source of all this trouble lay in less than a dozen churches, called Ritualistic; when we reflected that, with the exception of perhaps two of these, the rest were insignificant; when we reflected, moreover, that the influence of these churches did not seem to be on the increase, but on the wane; when we reflected that it was almost impossible for some of them to maintain their present standing and to continue their present services, I must say that many men felt that the cause of alarm had been exaggerated by the intense interest of the public in our affairs, and that we were not nearly so near destruction or heresy or schism as many men had supposed. And so, on the part of many of us, there was at first a great indisposition to enter into any course of legislation upon this subject. It was also evident to the minds of many of us that there was a growing variety of services throughout the land; that the æsthetic faculty had been brought as never before into our worship of Almighty God; that the Churches of Christ throughout this country had been seeking to allure men to the worship and to the love of Christ; and it was felt by many of us that it would be a dangerous thing and a wrong thing to crush down these æsthetic tendencies used for so high, so holy, and so noble a purpose. Manifestly throughout the congregations of our Church there has been a large increase of devotion shown by those significant contributions of the people, the offerings at the altar; and most certainly no man can have looked into our churches with his eyes open, without seeing that within the last few years there is in the attitude, in the whole tone, in the whole expression of the worshipping multitude, a grand, a glorious increase of outward and apparent devotion to our Master. And, sir, I beg to say on the part of the Committee on Canons that in regard to these things there was no disposition to crush, not the slightest disposition to repress. Matters of mere taste were not the cause of the excitement which has prevailed in the Church, and of the curiosity which has prevailed beyond it.

But it was said that practices which had been introduced had a doctrinal purport, and so far from that being denied on the part of those who had carried on certain Ritual practices, it has been openly proclaimed, and indeed has been made their only excuse for disturbing the peace and quiet of the Church by the introduction of such practices. "Why," they said, "it would not be worth the trouble to expose ourselves to all this obloquy if the thing had not a doctrinal significance. It has a doctrinal significance, and we intend to use it for a doctrinal purpose." This is the real cause why the mind of the Church has been disturbed, why this Council of the Church has been petitioned, and why your Committee is constrained to present this Canon, while in that Committee there are several

members at least, if not a majority, who would prefer not to present to you any canon at all. I say it is because of the doctrinal significance of this thing that we are compelled to come before you and bring in a Canon with all the reluctance that you could wish.

And there is something touching the doctrinal character of Ritualistic observances that touches the very roots of our manhood. It is this, that while no man will object to a priest of this Church, within the lawful limits of doctrinal freedom, preaching what he believes to be the truths of God, yet we do want him to preach it in words; we want him to stand upon his feet, as has been nobly done to the knowledge of this body, and to say what he believes; not to make women and children believe it without their ever hearing anything said. This is the thing that really, I think, has troubled our Church-people most, that their doctrine has been in danger of being invaded by indirection, and that, too, by men who would shrink from open expression of what they were thus seeking to teach.

Mr. President, it is certainly true that innovations upon Ritual do have such effect as to change the doctrines of the Church. The lesson of antiquity teaches this. It has been by posture, it has been by Ritual, not only that doctrines have been formed in the minds of Christian people, but also, thank God, by this same agency, that doctrines have been preserved. Look at the ancient liturgies, as they come down to us! To-day, how invaluable they are as teaching what was the settled doctrine, as well as the settled worship of the ancient Churches. And yet these liturgies grew up naturally from belief of that doctrine and has been the means of preserving that worship. So, among ourselves, a people so ready to change and adopt new things, so glad to get rid of old things felt to be burdensome, a people so confessedly restless, there has seemed to be a peculiar danger of our doctrines becoming unsettled by means of practices that in themselves perhaps are not objectionable.

So then in the Committee on Canons, as in this Convention, the feeling that has been all-pervading has been that this Convention ought, as far as possible, to protect the doctrine of the Church from indirect invasion. After the array of petitions which came in one morning, a startling question was presented to the House by my reverend and dear friend, the Clerical Deputy from Louisiana (Rev. Mr. Harris). He raised the point: The law of this Church is threefold; first, its organic law, contained in the Constitution; secondly, its Ritual and Liturgical law, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and particularly in the Rubrics of that Book; and thirdly, the Canon law, relating to such matters of detail as cannot be regarded as belonging to the other two; and he put this significant question, Whether we have a right to change the Ritual law of the Church, otherwise than as the Church declares we shall do it?

I am frank to confess that the Committee on Canons felt themselves exceedingly startled by this question. There were many members of that Committee who were decided in saying that no such thing, with their consent, could or should be done; that they would not invade the Book of Common Prayer; that they would not change the Rubrics by way of Canon; that the action coming from that Committee on Canons should be straightforward, direct, and should not touch the Ritual law of the Church as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, otherwise than as the Constitution of the Church provided.

I ought to state that the Committee on Canons reached some of its conclusions not by any direct discussion of the merits, but that gradually, as we conversed day after day and night after night, we

came to certain conclusions as to which we were substantially agreed; and I think, Mr. President, that as the youngest member of this Committee, now for the first time acting upon that Committee by your appointment, I have a freedom to say what no other member of the Committee could say, and that is that I never in my life have seen such ingenuousness; I never in my life have seen such candor; I never in my life have seen such readiness to listen, and yet at the same time we had thirteen tolerably hard heads to be reached, and thirteen tolerably forcible tongues to speak for what they individually believed. We sat five or six times before we could put one word to paper. We sat longer than that before we put down any words that had any meaning, going over and over the subject in order that we might if possible reach a principle. But then, substantially agreeing that we could not go beyond the bar placed in our way by the Reverend Deputy from Louisiana, we considered how we should appeal to the Rubrics, and what matters ought to be touched in the Rubrics, for evidently it was to the Rubrics we must go; and I think that the candor of this Committee on Canons, in dealing with this subject, is conspicuously manifest when you consider that the measure which I am here now advocating on their part is not the great measure of that Committee, but, on the contrary, the very least measure that that Committee has proposed to this House on the subject of Ritual, and that therefore this little measure has rightly been committed to me as the junior member of the Committee.

When we look at the Rubrics of the Church, we find, first of all, that we have to deal with defective Rubrics, that we also have to deal with doubtful Rubrics, and that in the construction of these defective and otherwise doubtful Rubrics, men with the very strongest purposes of truthfulness and rectitude come to directly opposite conclusions. Evidently, then, the Rubrics require some amendment, that they may carry out the object of telling men what they mean, instead of the Talleyrand object of concealing what the men who wrote them meant.

In the next place, we find that the various practices which have sprung up under these Rubrics have grown up in all honesty; that men have meant to do right; and that they have adopted practices which in their judgment are right, and it would be a hard measure indeed to condemn any of them, of one side or the other, as if they had been doing wrong.

Again, we find that from these causes the English Church has also been in sore tribulation these many years, and that the Convocations of the Church of England, including the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy, and even the Parliament of England, which used to be called the Lay Synod of England, have been considering how the Rubrics of the English Book of Common Prayer must be revised, that being the only way, in their judgment, to reach a wise conclusion of the matter.

When we began to consider all that this Synodical revision of the Rubrics means, we met again quite a number of things which demanded much attention. Persons seem to think that, if you touch only a word or two in a Rubric, you have done a very slight thing, but this is a very grave mistake. The Rubrics of our Church have their roots away back in the ancient history of the Church. The most insignificant Rubric of our Book of Common Prayer may really have its tap-root down in the days of the Apostles. And who likes to cut these things off? Who likes lightly to touch them? Who likes to lay rough hands on them?

Again, of all people in the world, I take it that this American people and this American Church of ours, wise as we all know it to be, are perhaps the least

able to touch the subject of Rubrics just at this particular moment. What do we know of Rubrics? How many are there among us who have made them a special subject of study? How many among us would dare to say this must be or this must not be so or so? I think the innate modesty of every Churchman in this assembly would lead him to say, "I dare not touch it." And let me say that the Rubrics of our American Book of Common Prayer require particularly delicate handling, because, the Rubrics of the ancient office books from which the English Book of Common Prayer was compiled, were written in language of perfectly exact and technical significance, so that every word meant exactly what it said. *Dicere* meant something that was expressed by nothing but *dicere*. *Cantare* meant something that was expressed by nothing but *cantare*. *Legere* meant something that was expressed by nothing but *legere*. But when changes came to be made in the English Book of Common Prayer throughout its subsequent revisions, there has been even less and less exactness; and in our American Book of Common Prayer I must say that the Rubrics are of an exemplary looseness; so that any one who would touch this subject must have gone into a vast and large and scholarly examination, not only of liturgies in general, not only of the manifold English Rubrics that were combined together at the time of the Reformation, not only of the revisions which have since been made of the English Book of Common Prayer, not only of the history (which our people know so little) of the wise and godly men who framed the American Book of Common Prayer, but he must be a master of language—of that delicate subtlety which belongs to the right use of liturgical speech. He ought to be steeped to the lips in Elizabethan English, or else he will be out of all true sympathy with the marvellous style of our Book of Common Prayer and even its structure, wonderfully beautiful as that is, in spite of the defects of its Rubrics.

In all these matters it is evident that very careful action must be entered into; and we felt also that, as we do not wish to touch the chords that bind us to our mother Church of England, we ought to be particularly careful in this matter of the revision of the Rubrics, so that, as in her Convocations this subject of Rubrics is, from day to day, and month to month, and year to year, with so much learning and critical acumen, canvassed, we may go on *pari passu* with her; adopting any of her suggestions that we can follow; and at the same time, perhaps, as a missionary Church, having some things to suggest that it might be well for the English Church to consider.

There was another matter that came before our Committee and was much spoken of, namely, that the sting of this whole matter of Ritual legislation might be taken out if we would go back to the originals of things. Why, sir, on the great subject of the vestments, does not everybody know that vestments had in the beginning no meaning at all? Does not everybody know that the vestments which were used were the vestments simply of good society or of philosophical teachers? And yet this question of vestments has had a factitious doctrinal meaning imparted to it which in no wise is inherent in it. When I saw that in the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury the Bishops had there proposed (and I trust that the proposal will be followed) that any legislation touching the ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be conducted upon the principle that such things had anciently, and are to have now, no doctrinal significance, I thanked God; for here is the true way to

touch the vestment question, so that neither those who use them shall be wounded, nor those who do not use them left in doubt as to their significance. They ought to be treated merely in the light of expediency and of propriety, and no other.

And, sir, it was desired to remove the doctrinal sting from the whole action of the Church in whatever the Church might do, because, however wrong some men may consider that other men are in the bosom of the Church, I do trust and I believe that this Church does not intend to plant the cruel heel on any school of godly men who in the fear of God can work beneath her banner. It is therefore that this thing cannot be done now as it ought to be done. Has not blood boiled in the last ten days? Mine has. Have not hearts been hot these last ten days? Mine has. And I ask the members of this Convention, if I were left, and I thank God I am not left, to make the legislation of this Church at this moment, what kind of Rubrics I would be likely to make? I take it that my honored and reverend brethren of the other school would not be willing to trust themselves now to make Rubrics. I do think that they would not dare to do it, for the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, and the worship of the Church as therein represented, are too sacred to be touched by any but by calm, clean hands, with bent knees, and with an humble, prayerful heart.

Therefore it was that our Committee felt that their grand measure should not be this thing of a Canon on Ritual. Our Committee felt that that was the least part of its work. Our Committee felt that the grand measure to be introduced by some one more fit than myself would be to ask you to raise a commission on the subject of Rubrical revision which might calmly and wisely take into consideration all this vast and sacred subject, and in due time, apart from passion, apart from contaminating influences, apart from anything like antagonism, with a scholarly and wise and reverent heart and hand, suggest at a future time to this body changes that may be necessary. And we felt that in doing so it could be made the duty of that commission to recognize facts as facts stand; that in fact ceremonies are in themselves things indifferent and alterable by ecclesiastical authority; that ceremonies may be useful or the reverse according as they are wisely used; that parishes in the pine woods, or on the frontier, for example, could never appreciate, and ought to have no need of a ceremonial which is used with so much devotion in this Church and the other churches of this venerable parish; and therefore, that there ought to be permitted a wide difference of ceremonial in every matter that does not effect doctrine.

Then again, sir, we felt that there must be shortened services; and in order that there might be no delay concerning the shortened services, I think we have a measure, either proposed or to be proposed, providing for that as soon as possible, so that on that necessary point there may be no delay.

Then as regards ceremonies, we felt that, to prevent future disturbance in the Church, we must endeavor through our commission to find out what is really the safe and the only safe maximum of ceremonial observance, and also the minimum of observance that this Church will permit her clergy to descend to.

I repeat that this is the measure of the Committee. The measure which I am introducing to-day is, if you will look at it, immeasurably less important. The measure that I have the honor to introduce to-day is simply an *ad interim* thing, until better can be done; and yet I think that this *ad interim* measure has been proposed and has been carried through the Committee

with as much tolerance, with as much wisdom, and with as much candor as could have been possible in any body on earth. After we had deliberated on the whole matter relating to Rubrical revision, and it took, as I think, some thirteen sessions before we reached this point, there remained only two points to be determined: one, how doctrine is assailed; and secondly, how the Church teaches us to protect doctrine.

You will observe that the Canon as it is before you in printed form is exceedingly careful to touch no ceremonial except that which belongs to the order of the celebration of the Holy Communion—none other. Processional hymns; recessional hymns; Sunday-school children's crosses; vestments of more or less beauty—these things are left entirely out. I trust the time has gone by when this Church can be pestered out of its dignity by proposed legislation on any such subjects as these. We have confined everything that we have proposed to this Convention to the single subject of the doctrine touching the Holy Communion, and here I rest our cause upon that subject. If a man wants to preach doctrine, let him preach it; but let him not insinuate it; let him do it like a man, and then, if his doctrine is erroneous, we can try him for it; if it is doubtful, he takes his chance as a manly man ought always to be willing to do. If he believes that God has put a parable in his mouth, then the word that the Lord has put in his mouth, that shall he speak. Do not let him say the Lord has put a parable in his mouth and that he does not dare to tell it, but will hold up a picture to represent it. We felt that frankness was to be demanded on all sides touching the doctrine of the Church.

Now, as to the doctrines touched in the Holy Communion, our Committee were wholly indisposed to express any opinion in respect to any phases of doctrine that might occur. We absolutely declined to declare what are erroneous doctrines. We absolutely declined to tell where the lines of limitation of the Church are set. We absolutely declined, therefore, to designate which are doubtful doctrines. Why? Because, I trust, and I believe I am right in trusting, that this Convention well knows that it is not the province of the Committee on Canons to determine that; nay, more, that it is not committed to this House to determine that.

The deposit of faith was committed to the Apostles of the Church, and through them to their successors; and it is a significant fact that, when a Bishop is admitted to minister in the Apostolic office in this Church of ours, he is required to make certain oaths as vows to God as well as to the Church. One of them is this: when he is asked the question, "Are you ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word?" "To banish"—it is a harsh word, perhaps, but it is there—"to drive away," as the shepherd drives away the wolf; it is strong language, but it is there, and the Bishop is required to promise that he will do so, and to declare: "I am ready, the Lord being my helper." And then, again, he is required to swear that he "will diligently exercise such discipline"—mark the word—"as, by the authority of God's Word"—not merely by the legislation of this Convention, but "by the authority of God's Word and by the order of this Church"—which may be Canonical or Rubrical or constitutional—"and by order of this Church is committed to him." "I will so do by the help of God," the Bishop answers. Evidently, then, there is power somewhere—power which is given—for when the Church exacts a man's oath that he will do it, it is understood that it gives him power to do it. On the other hand, when the deacon and priest are brought into their sacred orders, here is one of the

questions put to them. I want my brethren to listen to this; I want my brethren who are particularly careful of the question of Rubric and Canon to listen to this: "Will you reverently obey your Bishop and other chief ministers who, according to the *Canons* of the Church, may have the charge and government over you, following"—not reluctantly, but—"following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments." Canons have something to do with this subject, then; and although we cannot touch the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, we can recognize the Bishop as Ordinary, as possessing a real power, which we indeed have the right to regulate as to its exercise, but which all men are bound to recognize, and which the priest has sworn to follow with a glad mind and will. There we rest our cause; there we rest the protection of the Church, where God has put it, where the Church has recognized it, where the priesthood has sworn to respect it.

What is it that this Canon provides? It provides simply that when in due manner a Bishop shall have reason to believe that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have been set forth by ceremonial observances in the order for the Holy Communion, then it shall be his duty to do what everybody knows he ought to do; that is, investigate the matter, and in investigation to seek the counsel of his appointed Council of Advice—the Standing Committee. This is showing the Bishop how he may wisely give a godly admonition. And I think that when the Bishop of a Diocese, with his Standing Committee, generally including the clergy and laity, comes after a deliberate survey of the whole matter to say that practices or ceremonials are erroneous or doubtful, it is sufficient to prove already that the doctrine is at least doubtful. It needs no further investigation.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question right there? That the Bishop may do on the presentation of two Presbyters. Why have the laity no voice in this complaint?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I thank my friend from Georgia for asking that question, for two reasons. The first is, that I do not have to answer it, that being the province of my colleague from Pittsburgh (Mr. Burgwin); the second is, that we were quite sure that the inconvenient parishioner would appear somewhere, though I did not expect him to trouble us quite so soon in this debate. I may just as well say that it is because of the certainty of his appearance that we did not want to let him in.

To resume, we felt that this commission of the whole matter to the Bishop and the Standing Committee would secure what men ought to respect as a judgment; and that, avoiding questions of detail and practical Rubrical matters for the present altogether, we ought simply to require the priesthood and the diaconate of this Church to keep their sworn obligation. That is the point; and I may say that, in comparison with that one point, all the rest of this Canon is smoke. It is *the one point*. The only thing that our Committee on Canons is perfectly unanimous and determined in having respected is that thing, that the Episcopate shall no longer be an emasculated office in this Church, but that they shall be able to keep their sworn obligations, and that the clergy shall be required to keep theirs.

At the same time, our Committee felt that everything done in such a matter as this ought to be done with the utmost care that no rights should be invaded; and therefore a man even after this investigation has a perfect right to put himself upon his trial. He can be tried; he can demand a trial by his peers, and then the question is simply whether his peers of the Presbytery will or will not agree

with the Committee on Canons, and, as I hope and expect, with this Convention.

Thus, Mr. President, the whole object of our Committee has been to secure respect for the doctrine of the Church. It is true that in the course of our debates many times were introduced multitudinous specifications. Over and over again members of the Committee on Canons were desirous to at once proceed to specifications; and, truly, some of those specifications were formidable enough. In one paper before us I distinctly remember there were eleven paragraphs containing about thirty distinct specifications and about the small number of three thousand possibilities! It was very evident that we had no time to go into these specifications, and still less to argue the merits of the possibilities; and, therefore, the feeling of the members of the Committee on Canons was that we ought, if possible, to avoid specifications. Still it was held that some specifications ought to be introduced or the Canon would appear to be nugatory, and I must do my friends, who belong in most things to the other side from myself, the credit to say that, while they insisted with uncompromising firmness upon the introduction of some specifications, they nevertheless were willing to reduce them to the very small number of four; and moreover they were willing to go further still: for they consented that these four specifications should be introduced, not as the enactment of the Convention, but as examples of things which are already considered to be unlawful under the Rubrics and Canons of the Church. I well remember, when the Committee came to that point, when on the one side and the other the conclusion had been reached that the mind of the Church demanded that there should be a certain amount of give and take in this whole matter, that the Convention was looking to us not as individual gladiators to fight for our own colors, but as men of sense to try and meet the necessities of the Church; I remember the eagerness with which all sides of our Committee—I think I am not wrong in saying thirteen men in a committee of thirteen—grasped the suggestion, and immediately said, "There we stand together."

Mr. President, it must not be understood, and I trust it will not be understood that I myself, for example, would have introduced those specifications; but I do say that the Committee could come together on no other basis than that, and on that basis we agreed; thereby we stand: there we will stand until this Convention stands somewhere else.

Now, if you will allow me a few words more, I shall have done. We had done our best; and yet we were doubtful and exceedingly diffident of the result of our own mature judgment while there was so much of intense feeling and excitement in ourselves. We felt that we must carefully watch ourselves that we might do nothing unwise either by action or by omission; and therefore we called to our assistance, as a previous resolution of this House enabled us to do, the Committee on Canons of the other House—the House of Bishops. We were met by that Committee as represented by two of its most distinguished members. We submitted to them this Canon as it now is before this House, and almost to our astonishment, to mine, certainly, we found that that Committee said, "Gentlemen, we are satisfied with your work; and if you wish us to present it in our House independently of your action, we will gladly do it." The Committee on Canons did not accept that proposition. We thought we ought to mature our own matter in our own House and send our action to the other House. But I appeal to this Convention now to tell me just this one thing—and they will tell it significantly after a while—whether, taken as

a whole, the matured, deliberate judgment of thirteen men, representing pretty nearly all the schools in the Church, and then backed by the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops, is a thing to be set aside, or whether it does not demand the great and grave respect of this House?

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. Do I understand you to say that the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops were unanimously in favor of this Canon?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I understand it so.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I am authorized to say that they are not.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Very well, I can only say that the Bishop of Connecticut and the Bishop of Pennsylvania—my colleagues will corroborate it—gave us to understand that their Committee would unanimously adopt this Canon and present it to their House independently, if we chose.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I was authorized by the Chairman of the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops to say, after consulting with his co-members, that that Committee would unanimously recommend this Canon for adoption by their House, in case it was passed by ours.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. There are thirteen gentlemen on the floor who will attest the same point.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. There are thirteen men here who heard the thing said, and heard the thing said in a very small room where there was no doubt about the words.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I have to say that I had it directly from one of the Bishops upon the Committee on Canons that that Committee was not unanimous in favor of this Canon.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. That is a matter now, I suppose, of no importance. A mere question of a momentary variation, or a permanent variation, on the part of a Bishop will not determine the attitude of this House. The fact stands that the Committee on Canons of this House, and the Committee on Canons of the other House, agreed that this was the only basis on which we who represented this House could at present come together.

And now, Mr. President, I ask this House to proceed with the consideration of this Canon on its merits. I will not detain you three minutes longer.

If there be any man who thinks he is wounded by the proposal of this Committee, let not that man think that his feelings have not been considered. If there be any man in this House who thinks that his school is struck at by the Canon of the Committee, let that man banish from his mind the thought of any purpose on the part of this Committee to strike him or his school. Our Committee has desired simply this: that there shall be power to prevent things erroneous and doubtful; that that power shall be where the Church has already placed it; and that the obligations of the clergy may be met with a glad mind and will, if that be possible, but that they shall be met anyhow.

And now consider this action of our Committee, not as represented for the present in this little Canon, but consider it as a whole. The whole Church is before this Convention in everything that touches worship and Ritual order. It rests with this Convention to say whether there shall be large, noble flexibility given to the worship of the Church; whether these questions of trifles touching petty ceremonials shall not be sent for ever to "the tomb of the Capulets"; whether the Church shall not strip herself for her work and go forth conquering the land which the Lord has placed within our hands. That is the question. But it is not proposed to you in this

thing; it is proposed to you in the large measure for the revision of the Rubrics. In this which I have had the honor to submit to you to-day on the part of the Committee, I humbly suggest to this House that they will find that which will quiet the mind of the Church. They will find that which will be adequate to the present necessity. They will find that which will satisfy the sense of honesty, direct truth, and manhood in the Church, but which must not be mistaken as condemning that which is not touched, or as setting forth that which it does not maintain. I trust that even if others beside myself might have preferred a different form or a different action in regard to certain matters contained in this Canon, this House will pass it; and I stand pledged before this House, I stand pledged to the Committee on Canons, as we have pledged ourselves each to the other, representing this Convention as we thought we did, and feeling that there was need of unity of action, we all stand pledged to abide by this Canon, which we do trust this House will pass.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. As the Deputy from Alabama represents the Committee, I wish to ask him a question in regard to one point for information. It is in relation to the words "as for example." Is it meant, "to wit, such and such things," because "as for example" may mean a very wide range of things. The example is a mere specimen for the measuring or testing of other things which lie beyond the examples themselves. Does the Committee on Canons mean "to wit, such and such things"?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. This really illustrates the wisdom of myself in the Committee on Canons. I felt perfectly certain that I could not go more than three steps before I should be tripped up; and therefore I was too glad to obtain, as my colleague, Mr. Burgwin, of Pittsburgh, who will explain that matter, I have no doubt, to the satisfaction of my reverend friend from Pennsylvania.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I am exceedingly anxious to speak upon this subject, but it only wants three minutes of our lunch-time.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. I move that the gentleman from Wisconsin have any time within an hour in which to express his views. I move to suspend the rule in his case.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to suspend the rule so as to allow Dr. De Koven any time within an hour for his speech on this Canon.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That is a little invidious. We suspended the rule for the last speaker without limit, and I hope the same courtesy will be applied to this gentleman.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to suspend, as stated by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

The recess hour having arrived, the House took a recess for half an hour.

The session was resumed at two o'clock P.M.

SYNODS OF DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I have two reports from the Committee on Canons, which I desire to offer, with the permission of Rev. Dr. De Koven, in order that they may go on the Calendar.

The first report was read as follows:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a Proposed Canon, 'Authorizing the Formation of Synods of Dioceses,' respectfully report that, on account of the late period of the session which has been reached, they are of the opinion that it is inexpedient to proceed with the consideration of the subject, and they therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be dis-

charged from the consideration of the proposed Canon, 'Authorizing the Formation of Synods of Dioceses.'

"By order of the Committee.

"ALFRED A. WATSON,
"October 26, 1874." "Acting Chairman.
The resolution was placed on the Calendar.

STATE OF THE CHURCH.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, submitted the following report, which was placed on the Calendar :

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred the amendments to Canon 15, of Title I., proposed by the Committee on the State of the Church, respectfully report that they have considered the same and recommend their adoption, as contained in the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Sections 4 and 5, of Canon 15, of Title I., be amended so as to read as follows :

"Sec. 4. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese, or of the person or persons with whom the Journals or other ecclesiastical papers are lodged, to forward to the House of Deputies at every General Convention, on or before the first Monday of the session, the documents and papers specified in this Canon.

"Sec. 5. It shall be the duty of the Bishop and Standing Committee of the Church in every Diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, of the Standing Committee only, to prepare, previously to the meeting of every General Convention, a condensed report and a tabular view of the state of the Church in their Diocese, comprising therein a summary of the statistics from the parochial reports, and from the Bishop's addresses, specifying the capital and proceeds of the Episcopal Fund, and of all Benevolent and Missionary associations of Churchmen within the Diocese, and present the same to the Secretary of the House of Deputies on or before the first Monday of the session, for the purpose of aiding the Committee on the State of the Church, appointed by the House of Deputies in drafting their reports.

"By order of the Committee,

"ALFRED A. WATSON,
"October 26, 1874." "Acting Chairman.

PORTRION OF TEXAS TO BE MISSIONARY GROUND.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. With the consent of Dr. De Koven I ask the attention of the House while I make a report from the Committee of Conference in respect to the matter of Texas :

"The Committee of Conference, to whom was referred the memorial of the Diocese of Texas, together with the action of the House of Bishops and of the House of Deputies thereon, having had the same under consideration, respectfully report :

"That whereas the Diocese of Texas, by deliberate action of the Bishop and Convention thereof has for urgent and sufficient reasons declared its desire to establish its northern and western limits on the northern lines of Lampasas, Coryell, McLennan, Limestone, Freestone, Anderson, Smith, Gregg, and Marion counties; and on the western lines of Matagorda, Wharton, Colorado, Fayette, Bastrop, Travis, Burnett, and Lampasas counties ; and, whereas, this Convention is sufficiently assured of the consent of the parishes lying north and west of the aforesaid limits to the proposed limitation; and, whereas, while grave doubts are entertained by many of the power under our Constitution to permanently alter the territorial extent of a Diocese in this form, yet impressed by the great necessities of the Church in that Diocese, and of the justice of her claim for prompt relief. Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies concurring), That the General Convention hereby signifies its consent and agreement to the limitation of the jurisdiction of the Bishop and Convention of the Diocese of Texas to and within the limits above indicated, until such constitutional amendment and legislation thereunder can be secured as are necessary to remove the doubts aforesaid ; and that in the mean time the territory outside the limits aforesaid, and within the State of Texas, be held and treated as Missionary territory, and subject to Missionary jurisdiction.

WILLIAM R. WHITTINGHAM,
Bishop of Maryland.
CHARLES TODD QUINTARD,
Bishop of Tennessee.

HENRY NILES PIERCE,
Missionary Bishop of Arkansas, etc.
CHARLES H. HALL,
BENJ. A. ROGERS,
J. W. STEVENSON,
W. F. BULLOCK,
J. ISAAC HAZELHURST,
G. W. RACE,
E. T. WILDER,
EDMUND H. BENNETT,
EDWARD McCRA DY,
SAMUEL B. RUGGLES,
GEORGE F. COMSTOCK."

I move the adoption of that resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Subsequently, a message (No. 45) was received from the House of Bishops, announcing the passage of a resolution in the same words as that reported by Mr. Wilder.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. This is exactly the same as the resolution sent from our House. I move, to save all question, that we concur in the resolution of the House of Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNICANTS.

A message (No. 44) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That this House do concur in the resolution communicated to it in Message No. 25 from the House of Deputies relating to the discipline of communicant members, with the addition (the House of Deputies concurring) of the following proviso: 'Provided, That the action of this present Convention be not affected by such appointment.'"

On motion of Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, the proviso proposed by the House of Bishops was concurred in.

CANON ON RITUAL.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the proposed Canon on Ritual, reported from the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. Before Dr. De Koven commences his speech, I wish to inform the House that I cannot permit any interruption. I will call to order any person who rises to ask a question. If questions are to be asked, let it be done after the speaker has taken his seat or left the stand.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, before I begin I hope you will allow me to express my thanks to this House for the kindness and courtesy which was shown to me a moment since in allowing me to express myself on this occasion with such measure of time to do it as might be needed.

First of all, I fully recognize the point that was made by the clerical delegate from Alabama that this question is not to be considered as an isolated question. The Canon on Ritual comes up as one of four distinct measures that are brought before this

House. The Clerical Deputy from Alabama mentioned three of those measures, but failed to mention the fourth of them. Those measures are, first, this Canon on Ritual; second, the appointment of a commission by ballot to take up the whole question of the Rubrics and to report to the next General Convention, if desirable, a revision of the Rubrics. The third is the whole matter of shortened services, a matter which I believe weighs very seriously upon the heart and the conscience and the mind of this Church; and the fourth was a measure introduced either by the Committee on Constitutional Amendments or by the Committee on Canons—I think the latter—providing for certain freedom in the use of the baptismal service, permitting certain Rubrics to be made permissive instead of absolute, and also the use of the Collect for Easter Even, instead of the thanksgiving in which the word “regenerate” occurs. I say, we cannot possibly consider this Canon on Ritual except we consider it as one of a group of measures, and so it is as absolutely necessary that one’s position on all those measures should be clearly defined.

I say then, first of all, with regard to the last of these measures, upon which the Clerical Deputy from Alabama said nothing, that I suppose it is hardly likely that this House can pass the proposed measure which was brought in by the Committee on Canons, and in the bringing in of which they reserved to themselves the right not to vote upon the measure which they brought in. I say I suppose this House can scarcely pass it, because I believe it will be found on consideration that any such measure touches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and therefore there will be a large majority of this House who cannot assent to it. And yet while I say this I am free to acknowledge that I regard the motive of bringing in that resolution, or proposed Canon, or whatever it was, as being worthy of the most profound consideration of this General Convention. It is a fact that cannot be gained that our Church has permitted to enter her orders, to serve at her sanctuary, to be her priests, men who do hold, and who have always held, and who held it when they were ordained, not the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which I myself hold and which I firmly believe to be, in some shape or other, the authorized doctrine of this Church, and which to deny is, I believe, to deny that article in the Nicene Creed which says, “I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.” Now, here is my point. I say a Church which permits and allows people to serve at her altars not holding a doctrine which may be said to be a doctrine of this Church, or may be denied to be a doctrine of this Church, is cruel to them, if she perpetually requires them to say what they do not believe; and therefore, while it would be hard for me, indeed I would oppose with the utmost of my power anything which would throw the slightest doubt upon the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, I for one should be prepared to refer to this Committee on the Revision of the Rubrics, provided such a commission should be appointed, the consideration of some means whereby the Bishop of the Diocese or the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese should have the power to protect and to defend real and true conscientious scruples wherever they may be.

I feel most happy, Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Convention, at the large-hearted and Christian-like statesmanship of the measure which proposes that a commission shall be selected by this House by ballot to consider the whole question of the revision of the Rubrics. It is evident to anybody who has studied the subject that the pro-

visions of the Church in this country on the subject of our Ritual law are eminently vague and unsatisfactory. I know full well that there are legal gentlemen who have the power to trace through I know not what dark sources all sorts of laws that go back first to the Church of England and then go back to the Catholic Church, and I bow with great reverence to all such legal acumen. I merely mean to say that, for a clear, definite system of law, the whole thing is so full of vagueness and indefiniteness that it does not come practically before the mind of this Church; and surely the time has come, or if it has not come to-day it is coming, when this Church of ours should be prepared to say, not in the interests of any narrowness, not in the interests of bigotry or intolerance, but in the broadest-hearted way, what is the limit of Ritual on the one hand, and what, on the other, giving scope for services which shall be free from all sorts of Ritual, that men may go where they will, and use extempore prayers and preach the Word of God wherever it is needed; and permitting those, on the other hand, who love a high and holy service, to have all the glory and the beauty which belong to God’s holy Catholic Church; and I say that a commission formed in that broad-hearted spirit will serve to protect this Church from perpetual accusations of licentiousness and lawlessness against those who would rather die than disobey one of our known laws.

I come now to the Canon which is before us; and, first of all, I must explain just precisely what I wish to effect with regard to it. If I could have my own way, I am free to say that I would much prefer that there would be no Canon passed whatsoever. At the same time, the main principle of this Canon I assent to as a measure for the time, until such time as the law of this Church on the subject of Ritual is laid down. That is to say, I feel, if matters are doubtful, it is infinitely better that the Bishop and the Standing Committee of the Diocese should have the power to regulate it than that individual presbyters should have that power; and if any one says that such a principle will make a use for Wisconsin and a use for Ohio, which uses will differ, I have only to say that it is infinitely better to have a differing use in Wisconsin and a differing use in Ohio than to have forty different uses in Wisconsin and forty different uses in Ohio. But I only accept this, let me say, as a measure for the time, to meet a difficulty, because our law is not clear, is not distinct, and until such time as it is clearly and definitely laid down. Consequently, while I am prepared to vote for the main principle of this Canon, there are some portions of it which I could not possibly vote for, and which it will be my object to show to this House that, if we do vote for, we shall make a mistake, a mistake that nobody here would like to fall into.

In the first place—and this point I am not going to dwell upon—I do think that the forbidding of particular things like the use of incense, the placing or carrying or retaining a crucifix—I am not particular about those things; but the forbidding of any particular thing does interfere with that principle which has been laid down by the Deputy from Alabama, and which I believe to be a true principle. This Church cannot legislate upon her worship in any other way than by Rubric; this Church cannot legislate upon her doctrine in any way except by an article of religion; and if this House, or any other House, attempts to legislate upon Ritual or upon doctrine by indirection, there are many who will feel that it is unconstitutional; and this is my point: the forbidding of certain particulars does seem to interfere with that principle, for it may be just as much go-

ing against that principle to forbid certain things as it is to allow them. It is not positive indeed, but it is negative; and thus by specifying certain things, as is done in this Canon, I think the great principle is interfered with.

I come now to my second objection to the Canon, and that is to the clause which is to be found in the first section: "If any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters." The clause that I object to is, "Or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters." It is quite right that the Bishop should govern his Diocese; it is quite right that his standing Committee should be his council of advice; but I must say that I trust this House is not going to organize the Reverend Paul Pry into a canonical institution in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Are we to have two or more Presbyters—and, generally, the Presbyters who would go about on that business are not the most earnest and the most devout that can be found—for this melancholy purpose? I would not wish to be the Presbyter who should go and visit his brother's parish for the purpose of finding out just what he was doing, and measuring the angle at which he bowed, or the kind of devotion that he showed when he knelt on his knees in the church. I say that to organize two Presbyters to go and find out what other people are doing is simply to organize something which the gentlemanly heart of our Church will utterly and totally condemn. And here let me say that I recognized the importance of the question which was put by a Lay Deputy from Georgia to the Clerical Deputy from Alabama. He asked, "Why not laymen?" Certainly if they have Presbyters to do it, by all means, if laymen want it, give them the same privilege. But let me say that the Canon is wiser than the Clerical Deputy from Alabama showed that it was, because it does provide and provides an honorable way for this thing. It says that the Bishop may call together his Standing Committee as a council of advice, and with them investigate the matter. He can send his clergy, the dignified clergy of his Diocese; he can send the laity, representatives of his Diocese. They can go in an honorable, straightforward way. They can say, "We have come to investigate your practices, and we have come to see whether you are symbolizing wrong doctrines." They can do it in a canonical and proper manner; and let me say that I do not believe there is any clergyman in this Church who would not accept such a visitation and be glad of it, and explain anything which might seem doubtful or be supposed to symbolize erroneous doctrine.

I am aware—and here I must say something which I hope I shall be excused for saying—that there is a sort of public idea that Ritualists (and I do not quite like to say this, because everybody knows that I am the only clerical Ritualist in this House, so that I may possibly seem to be defending myself)—there has been a sort of idea that Ritualists are very disingenuous, and I can hear down in the heart of some gentleman who so believes a thought something like this: "Well, if the Bishop sent his Presbyters and laity to examine into this matter, that cunning Ritualist then would not do the things, you know." [Laughter.] Well, Mr. President, all I have to say is, that if there is any Ritualist of this sort, I am inclined to think you will scarcely bind him by canonical regulations; but, if he can cheat in this way, he may perhaps find a way to cheat you in another; but I am happy to say that I do not know any Ritualist who could possibly be guilty of such a wrong.

And now I come to my third point, and that is to be found in the third line of this same section:

"Ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion, not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines." The word that I want to object to is the word "doubtful." I was very much amused at the Clerical Deputy from Alabama, who read from the Prayer-Book what a Bishop was required to promise. He read that he was required to promise that he would drive away erroneous and strange doctrines. The Bishop is never required to drive away erroneous and doubtful doctrines. Permit me to say, gentlemen, that there are no such things as doubtful doctrines. Doctrine is either true or false. The Truth of God is true, and the lies of the devil are false. There can be no such thing as doubtful doctrines. The term is used in its subjective sense. Objectively, all doctrines are true or false. Subjectively, you and I may doubt about them. My objection to it is, that it covers a field the extent of which we do not realize.

One Presbyter may think a doctrine doubtful, and another Presbyter may not think it doubtful; one standing committee may think it doubtful, and another standing committee may not think it doubtful. Or, as our standing committees change every year, the standing committee of 1874 may decide it to be doubtful, and the standing committee of 1875 may decide it to be true; and perhaps that very thing may be the issue upon which the standing committees may be elected or defeated. Therefore let me say that the change in the old-fashioned words, "strange or erroneous doctrines" into "erroneous or doubtful doctrines," is simply to introduce into this Church the beginning of endless confusion.

And now I come to the particular specifications. Let me say that I believe this Church has the right, if it does it in a lawful way, to regulate its ceremonies as it pleases; and if it chooses to forbid the use of incense, I have nothing to say. I am a Presbyter of this Church of twenty years' standing, and I am accused of Ritualism. Allow me to say that, though I have attended Ritualistic services in England and this country, and I am well aware that incense is and has been used, I never was in any church in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church in which incense was used. I remember upon one occasion having a gentleman call to see me at my own chapel, and when he arrived in the chapel a very singular thing came over him. He commenced making a sort of snuffing as if he were smelling something; and finally he said to me, "My dear brother, is that incense that I smell?" [Laughter.] I was compelled to say to him that I never had used incense, and that I thought the smell was nothing but the smell of oakwood; and he was perfectly satisfied. [Laughter.]

Now let it be noticed; and in order to get the force of my argument you will have to follow the Canon, and I believe the argument to be one which, if I can set it forth, will convince the House that at least that specification, "the use of incense," is an utter piece of nonsense. Let us see. It says, "Ceremonies, or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion not ordained or authorized in the Book of Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction; and, as examples, the following are declared to be considered as such."

—That is, it does not simply forbid the use of incense—I wish that were all. What it does is to say that the use of incense symbolizes erroneous and strange doctrines, which is a dreadful thing to commit this House to. For this House

to forbid the use of incense is a very proper thing, perhaps; but for this House to say that the use of incense symbolizes false doctrines, is for this House to put itself in utter and total opposition to the Holy Scriptures; for, remember, what does David say? "Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice." In other words, David says that the use of incense, to which that holy prophet and king was accustomed—having not lived in our own day—symbolized prayer; and will this Church say—is it prepared to say, that the use of incense, which symbolizes prayer, symbolizes false doctrine?

Then again, I heard it read in St. Thomas's Church yesterday morning at the beginning of the services, "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." I am not going to enter into the question whether that was a prophecy of something that was literally to take place. Some people say it was, but I am afraid they are Ritualists. My only question is as to its symbolical meaning. The prophet Malachi holds that incense symbolizes the pure offering, I suppose the Eucharistic offering, and for the sake of this argument I am willing for the moment to concede that that offering is nothing but an offering of prayer and thanksgiving; but I do not think so. Then we are to understand that incense, symbolizing the pure Eucharistic offering, symbolizes false doctrine! Or again—and this is something more awful—when Aaron stood between the dead and the living with the censor in his hands, and the smoke of the incense was wafted to heaven, the people were saved. What did he typify but that eternal Son of God who alone stands between the dead and the living, and whose mediation for the souls of men for ever ascends to the right hand of God? and that ascending incense symbolized the atoning sacrifice and the everlasting mediation. And is this Church, then, prepared to say that the eternal mediation and the awful atoning sacrifice are false doctrines; or, when the priest on the great day of atonement went before the mercy-seat, and clouds of incense covered it, typifying the ceaseless intercession of the Son of God, is this Church prepared to say that such a use of incense symbolized false doctrines? But this Canon, if it be passed as it stands, makes it so.

I pass over the second specification, although I must say that I do not think the iconoclasm goes quite far enough; for, when in St. Thomas's Church only yesterday morning I witnessed the great statues of the Apostles standing all around, I am free to say that, had I not been as much of a Protestant as I am, as I bent and bowed I might have been led into the Roman error of worshipping images or something of that kind. [Laughter.] I do not think that thing goes quite far enough. Cut out your crucifix from your stained windows, put them out of your prayer-books, forbid pictures as well as images, if it be necessary; but do not let us believe in this day that the mere looking at the image of the human nature of our Divine Redeemer, and exciting our emotions by his thorn-crowned brow and his bleeding head and pierced hands, can possibly be said to symbolize false doctrine.

Now, I pass over "the Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made," only with one remark, for it will answer something that was said by the Clerical Deputy from Maryland, and that is this: that if that is to be decided to be a thing which symbolizes false doctrine, I am free to

say that we pronounce against every other true portion of the Christian Church that has ever been since the beginning of time; no one can read the ancient Liturgies without finding just this: "When the consecration is over, before priest or people have received, and the priest comes forward holding the holy things in his hands, turning towards the people he says, 'Holy things for holy persons,' and the people answer, 'To Thee, O Lord,' and burst forth into a hymn of adoration, and of praise to the present Saviour"—I say that after the consecration is over, according to the Liturgy of St. Mark, which writers on this subject date back to about the year 200, the priest comes forward with the holy things in his hands, and actually turns to the people and says, "Bow the knee to Jesus," and the people answer, "To Thee, O Lord." Again, I say that in the Liturgy which the most careful Anglican writers declare to be that Liturgy that most represents the mind of the Apostles, the Clementine Liturgy, when the priest comes forward and says, "Holy things for holy people," the people break forth into this hymn, "Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth peace and good-will toward men; Hosanna to the son of David; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; God is the Lord, and He hath appeared unto us. Hosanna in the highest."

And let me call the attention of the Lay and Clerical Deputies from New Jersey to the fact that I am told that in the Diocese of New Jersey the Bishop, when he consecrates, when he comes to that part of the service where he breaks the bread, turns around to the people, and breaks it in presence of the people, and again in the apsidal chancel, when the priest stands behind the altar facing the people, he does exactly that self-same thing, and shall we say that this symbolizes false doctrine?

Now, I come to another point: "Any act of adoration of or toward the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflexions, and all such like acts, not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer." I am exceedingly pleased to find that this Canon makes a distinction which the public mind has not made before this session. I was delighted to hear the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Huntington), who is always clear in whatsoever he says, state very carefully and distinctly the difference between outward adoration and inward adoration, between external acts of adoration and internal acts of love and honor. The distinction is a vital one. It is one which it behooves this Church carefully to remember, for I am free to say one thing which, believe it, I say with the deepest humility; and yet I know when I say it there are a thousand hearts that will respond to me. You may take away from us, if you will, every external ceremony; you may take away altars, and super-altars, and lights, and incense, and vestments; you may take away, if you will, the eastward position; you may take away every possible ceremony; and you may command us to celebrate at the altar of God without any external symbolism whatsoever. You may give us the most barren of all observances, and we will submit to you. If this Church commands us to have no ceremonies, we will obey. But, gentlemen, the very moment any one says we shall not adore our Lord present in the Eucharist, then from a thousand hearts will come the answer, "Let me die in my own country and be buried by the grave of my father and my mother; for to adore Christ's person in his Sacrament, that is the inalienable privilege of every Christian and Catholic heart. How we do it, the way we do it,

the ceremonies with which we do it, are utterly, utterly indifferent; the thing itself is what we plead for, and I know I should not plead to unkind or unfeeling hearts. I remember those words of the great Christian poet:

"No distance breaks the tie of blood;
Brothers are brothers evermore;
Nor wrong nor wrath of deadliest mood
That magic may o'erpower.
Oft ere the common source be known
The kindred drops will seek their own,
And throbbing pulses silently
Move heart toward heart by sympathy.

"So is it with true Christian hearts:
Their mutual share of Jesus' blood
An everlasting bond informs
Of holiest brotherhood.
O might we all our lineage prove,
Give and forgive, do good and love,
In mutual efforts of kind strife,
Lightning the load of daily life.

"There is much need, for not as yet
Are we in safety or repose;
The holy house is still beset
By leaguer of stern foes;
Wild thoughts within, bad men without,
All evil spirits round about
Are banded in unblest device
To spoil love's earthly paradise.

"Then draw we nearer, day by day,
Each to his brethren—all to God.
Let the world use us as she may,
We may not lose our road;—
Not wandering, though in grief to find
The martyrs' foes still keep her mind;
But fixed to hold love's banner fast,
And by submission win at last."

And yet I am thankful to say that this clause, marked "d," instead of forbidding Eucharistic adoration, is the most definite assertion of it that ever was passed in our Church since the time of the Reformation, and I mean to prove that fact. I do not know, of course, whether there was any Ritualist amongst the great Committee of Thirteen. I do not know how this came to pass. I do not know whether it befell them as it does sometimes befall men, that they build other than they intend to. But I do not hesitate to say that that clause is the greatest assertion of Eucharistic adoration that has ever been passed since the time of the Reformation. Now let me prove it.

You will please look at the words, "any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflexions, and all such like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer." In other words, if there is any such act allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, then *that* we have a right to do. Now, if I can prove that there is such an act allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, and that, historically, this Church has a very peculiar relation to this act, then I think I shall have proved my point. Now, in the Book of Common Prayer there is but one Rubrical direction of this sort. It is all I want. We are allowed to kneel, and I do not want any other posture whatsoever to express my feelings of adoration to Christ. We are allowed to kneel. Everybody knows that. It does not need to be proved by looking into the Prayer-Book. Now, that question as to kneeling in the Eucharist has historically been a very vexed question in the Anglican Church. No sooner was the first Book of Edward VI. put out than the King

and his Council surreptitiously put into it, without the consent of the Convocation, an explanation of the kneeling; and the explanation showed what they thought the kneeling might mean, that this kneeling is not meant to express any adoration of "any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." But no sooner did Bloody Mary come in than she abolished it, and when Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne she did not revive it, for the Prayer-Book of Elizabeth has not that declaration in it. When King James the First came to the throne, his Prayer-Book did not have it either, and it was not until the time of Charles II. that the question came up, and then it came up in this way: Those people who were not willing to consent to the Act of Uniformity sent in to the Savoy Conference, at the beginning of the reign of Charles II., a series of objections to things in the Prayer-Book, and one of those objections was to kneeling in the Holy Communion, because it implied adoration; and then the divines of King Charles's time, who were assuredly suspected of being very High Church indeed, quite inclined towards the Laudian school, while they put in that declaration as to kneeling did it with a significant alteration. That alteration was that no adoration is due to any "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." They changed the words "real or essential presence" to the words "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood;" and ever since around that declaration of kneeling there has been a contest in the Church of England; and there was a contest only the other day, and the judgment of the Privy Council, which I have here, declares expressly, though the Privy Council of course, everybody knows, is tolerant of everything excepting faith, I say the Privy Council in their judgment expressly assert that the declaration of kneeling cannot be so construed as to deny the right to adore Christ present in the elements; that it includes both ideas.

Now I come to my argument. Strangely enough, when the American Book of Common Prayer was adopted, the declaration of kneeling was left out. It is not to be found in our Book of Common Prayer, and I think I know the reason why. It pleased God to give to Bishop White an utter abhorrence of all Calvinism, and he knew that that Rubric could be interpreted in a Calvinistic direction; and, though you cannot find any allusion to its omission in the records of the time, some how or other it slipped out, and I suppose it slipped out precisely as a single word in the Catechism has slipped out. It says, "The Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God"; that is the way it reads in the English Prayer Book; but in our Prayer-Book it is, "The Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the people of God." The word "elect" was left out under a mistake, no doubt, but under that dreadful terror of possible Calvinism which so affected the excellent first Bishop of Pennsylvania.

It will be justly said that this clause of the Canon is a contribution in the same direction, and when it impliedly asserts that there are certain acts of adoration which are authorized and allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, and people remember that kneeling is allowed, it will not take twenty-five years before this clause of the Canon will wheel into line, and will be an argument in favor of Eucharistic adoration in the books of that day of the very strongest character. And let me say that, if our debates go down to posterity, as I trust they may, the fact that I have pointed this out to this House, being duly recorded and duly read, will add a point and pungency to the

fact, if you pass it without disproving what I have to say.

These are my objections to the Canon, and I intend to propose an amendment to this Canon. I would not for the world bring it before this House without having first submitted it to the Committee on Canons. They tell us that like the Greeks of old they have burned their ships, and mean to stand or fall by this Canon; and woe betide me if I attempt to pass anything through this House with the great Committee against me, and so I will not propose it to this House; I will only propose that it be referred for their consideration to the Committee on Canons. Now let me read it; and I believe, although I have argued with a great deal of earnestness, what I have to say is really in the interest of truth, and peace, and kindness, and love, and the settlement of difficulties.

"If any Bishop shall have reason to believe that ceremonies or practices, during the celebration of the Holy Communion, not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, or setting forth or symbolizing doctrines not according to those of this Church, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction, it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his council of advice, and with them to investigate the matter; and if, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and Standing Committee that doctrines not in accordance with those of this Church have in fact been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices," etc.

And the rest of the Canon is just the same. The amendment merely leaves out these specifications; it leaves out the word "doubtful" in connection with "doctrines"; it leaves out the two prying Presbyters, and keeps the Bishop and Standing Committee to their duty; and if they do it, I am free to say that all over this country there will be a tolerable freedom from rites, and ceremonies, and practices which offend the mind of this Church. That is my proposition. I say, I consider it in the interest of truth and peace; and if such a proposition is brought forward, I myself will vote for it. I understand that a Lay Deputy from Maryland has a Canon drawn up that he wishes to bring forward, and if at this moment it would be of any service to him to bring it forward, to be referred at the same time to the Committee on Canons, it will give me great pleasure to yield the floor to him for that purpose, if it be not taken out of my allotment of time.

Mr. BLANCHARD, of Maryland. Is that legitimate?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I ask the Rev. Doctor from Wisconsin to repeat his proposition.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. The Canon I propose?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Precisely.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I will read it again:

"If any Bishop has reason to believe that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing doctrines not in accordance with those of this Church, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction, it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his council of advice and with them to investigate the matter; and if after investigation it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that doctrines not in accordance with those of this Church have, in fact, been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid," etc.

And the rest of the Canon is just as was reported.

It is merely leaving out the specifications and the two unhappy Presbyters and the "doubtful doctrine."

Mr. BLANCHARD, of Maryland. Now if the gentleman wishes I will read my proposition. The following is proposed as a substitute for the enacting part of the Canon reported by the Committee:

"The following ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion are hereby prohibited:

"1. The use of incense.

"2. The placing, or carrying, or retaining a crucifix in any part of the place of public worship.

"3. The elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects to which adoration is to be offered.

"4. Any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion.

"Sec. 2. If any Bishop have reason to believe that the ceremonies or practices hereby prohibited have been introduced into any parish or congregation within his jurisdiction, it shall be his duty to admonish in writing the minister of the parish or congregation aforesaid to discontinue such ceremonies or practices, and, if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee of the Diocese to cause him to be tried before the proper ecclesiastical court of the Diocese having jurisdiction of the offences for which ministers may be tried and punished."

I offer that as a substitute.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. At the end of my speech I propose to offer my amendment, and also this substitute which is proposed; but if the Committee on Canons desire it, I will simply propose that they be referred, or if they tell me I shall not be doing discourtesy to the Committee, I will venture to propose them immediately to the House, for I do not venture to interfere with what I think is a rightful thing, that a Committee constituted like that which has had this subject before it, and has reported to us a Canon, which I am ready to acknowledge is very moderate, and which, no doubt, has been the result of a good deal of consideration and of a certain amount of compromise, should not have at least the opportunity of fully considering the proposed amendment.

Now, I come to something which is perhaps more important than anything I have said already, and yet which I feel constrained to say. I listened with a certain amount of astonishment to an assertion which was made in a different way by two persons in this House during the course of our debates. A gentleman said here that a certain person did not believe in Eucharistic adoration. Another gentleman said that Eucharistic adoration was a doctrine tolerated in our Church. And there are a great many people who evidently believe that Eucharistic adoration is a thing that is not only not allowed, but is very wicked and very sinful. Now, I have only to say that, while I have no question that the gentlemen who use this language have in their own minds a clear and determinate sense in which they use it, yet to say that one does not believe in Eucharistic adoration, or to say that Eucharistic adoration is a tolerated doctrine, is simply to say a thing which to the theological mind is simply and totally unintelligible; for—and here I am going to take a bold flight of ambition—if there be one man in this House whom I admire for his logic, for his clearness, for his wonderful power of management, it is a Clerical Deputy from Virginia (Rev. Dr. Andrews), whose voice has scarcely been heard during this Convention. I always tremble when he speaks. Now let me

say that in my poor humble way I desire to follow him; and when I read in a very clever and able article that he had found out no less than seven ways in which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration might be held in our Church, I tried to think in how many ways the doctrine of Eucharistic adoration might be held somewhere. But, even after long effort, I have only been able to discover six. So I am just one behind him, and I am glad in this respect that Wisconsin is not quite so advanced as Virginia. [Great laughter.]

The PRESIDENT. If there is any attempt at applause, the galleries will have to be cleared.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. The first sense in which Eucharistic adoration may be held to be affirmed, or denied, or tolerated, is that to which I have already alluded—namely, that acts of adoration paid towards or to the elements make up Eucharistic adoration; and yet it is quite possible that a man may go through all sorts of genuflections and prostrations, and never adore Christ in the Eucharist at all. The Clerical Deputy from Maryland (Rev. Dr. Leeds) told us that in the Eastern Church, at the greater entrance, when the elements unconsecrated are brought forth, the people prostrate themselves before the unconsecrated elements in token of their belief in the coming down of the Son of God into this world; and so it is possible that for far less reason than the adoring of Christ in the Eucharist, for the sake of all sorts of things, a man may go through with external acts of adoration. But I have said sufficient about that. The distinction, I trust, is impressed on the mind of this House.

The second is (and I have heard people say it in this House), that it is wrong to adore the Sacrament. The word "sacrament," as everybody knows, is an ambiguous term, and may mean either the outward elements, or that union of the outward and inward which makes up the Sacrament, or, again, the whole sacramental rite. I suppose when they say this they mean the outward part of the sacrament. It is quite possible that in Mexico and the states of South America, and possibly in Southern Europe, where the host is carried about the streets—a practice which I believe to be a terrible evil—it is possible that the ignorant may adore the outward elements; but I never heard or knew of anybody in our Church or in the Church of England who held to any such erroneous or false doctrine.

There is a third sense in which a man may hold Eucharistic adoration. He may believe that after consecration the substance of Christ's Body and Blood has taken the place of the substance of the bread and wine, and that nothing but the accidents of the bread and wine remain. In other words, he may hold the doctrine of the Council of Trent on the subject of transubstantiation, and, when he falls down before the consecrated elements, he may be adoring not the substance of the bread and wine, but the substance of Christ's Body and Blood hidden under these veils, and believing in transubstantiation, may adore Christ present in His substance; and this the Roman Church does. Let me say that, I do not know of any one in our Church who holds to Eucharistic adoration in that sense; and when I heard a Lay Deputy from Kentucky, in a very able and interesting speech, say that he only wished that somebody, whose name shall not be mentioned, would come out and say, "I abhor and detest the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation," I feel certain that any well-trained Churchman would be able to say that. And now, I come to the fourth view of Eucharistic adoration, and that is, that a man may hold that Christ's body and blood, and so Christ's human nature, and so Christ Himself, is in sacramental union

with the bread and wine after consecration, not by transubstantiation, not by impanation, not by consubstantiation, not by a view which is largely held in our Church and which is known as identity of substance; but in sacramental union with the holy elements, and so, not adoring the external elements, may yet pay his reverent homage to the Son of God whom he believes to be present in His own sacrament. Or again, a man may hold in our Church, and if he does so he can claim very venerable authority for it, and I am free to say that the difference between this view and the other is rather a difference of words than of things—he may hold that Christ our Lord is personally present by His Divine Person in the Holy Eucharist. He may hold that Christ's human nature is present there, first by way of conjunction, secondly by way of co-operation, and thirdly by way of force and efficacy; and holding that Christ in His Divine Person is there, and there to give us His own Body and Blood, though that Body and blood be not in the mind of this person connected with the elements, he too may adore Christ present in the Eucharist.

Or again, he may hold something which I believe the conscience of this Church will utterly and totally give up, but which nevertheless is held in our Church, and that is that Christ our Lord is to be adored and only adored at the right hand of His Father in heaven; and holding that, he may believe that the Eucharist is the very special opportunity for paying his express adoration to Christ, though absent in heaven; and he too may adore Christ by means of the Eucharist, though he may adore Him as only at the right hand of His Father.

And so I assert that there are no less than six ways in which a man can believe in Eucharistic adoration—two of them which are not held in our Church at all, one of them which no logical mind can possibly hold, and the other three of which, I am free to say, include in some one of their forms ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; and therefore I assert that when a man says he does not believe in Eucharistic adoration, or asserts that it is tolerated or not tolerated, without further explanation, he says something that is totally unintelligible. And this leads me to a thought which is of the gravest possible description. Our Church in this country was planted in the darkest days of the Church of England. It brought over here every narrow feeling, every insulated policy, every miserable convenience that resulted from the connection of the Church and State; and for 177 years our Church was left without a Confirmation, without an Ordination, without a Bishop, for all these evils to crystallize around her. And when it pleased God to give us Bishops, what for seventy years has been the life of the American Church? She has been struggling for her own; she has been grasping at the truth of God; she has been seeking for that which was her heritage from the ages; she has been striving to obtain in all its fulness that which came down to her from her fathers. When I was a boy, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was a doubtful doctrine, so very doubtful that a man scarcely dared to say that he held it, and I have lived to see petitions presented to this House desiring the alteration of the Prayer-Book because it does distinctly assert the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Now let me say about the doctrine of the Eucharist, there is precisely this, that we have not arrived at a full and clear determination about it. Better a thousand times, my brethren, that rash and incautious expressions should be used, better that things should be said that the great heart of this

Church may possibly condemn, than that we should hastily formulate this doctrine. Let me illustrate: I know there is an illustration which presents itself to your own minds, and which it is quite impossible for me to assent to after the adjectives with which I have qualified it. Nor do I mean to apply those adjectives to this that I shall say:

Within the past three years I have read a charge from a Bishop of this Church, honored, venerated, one of the noblest and best of our most aged Bishops, advocating something which he called in terms Zwinglianism. I have read also a pamphlet of a Clerical Deputy from Virginia, advocating the same thing. I do not mean to say that it was Zwinglianism; but, nevertheless, it was a clear and definite expression of what anybody would say was a very Low Church view of this subject, and I have never heard a single word said against it. I have never read an article in any newspaper against it. I have never heard that it was going to make a crisis in the Church. I never heard that the man who held it was not to be elevated to the Episcopate. I have seen that it had free scope and fair play, and for my part I would give it free scope and fair play too. Let this Church on this doctrine preserve its equanimity. Let it study. Let it read. Let it pray. Let it think. Let men who have the grace and the gift of understanding pour forth their contributions; and if there are things that ought not to be said, free thought, free play, free consideration, and full consideration never harmed the Church in any way; for, mark you, it is a philosophical truth, which no man can read ecclesiastical history without understanding, that no doctrine, though it be formalized never so often, becomes the doctrine of any church until that doctrine receives the moral unanimity of its members; and if any one here should be tempted either by Rubric or by Article to attempt to take away from the doctrine of this Church on the Eucharist, it would only be endeavoring to do something which in time to come this Church will rise as one man, clerical and lay, and sweep away.

And now, Mr. President, I want to say one word—

The PRESIDENT. It will be necessary to ask for an extension of your time.

Rev. Dr. DALZELL, of Louisiana. I move that full time be given to the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. It will be remembered in this House that in the last General Convention, under peculiar circumstances, I stated a phrase which I hardly need to repeat because it has been so often rung in my ears and in the ears of others; "that I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine." I then expressed what was my conviction on this subject, but I did not express it merely because it was my conviction. The object which I had in expressing it was something which has clearly and evidently been lost sight of. Woe be to that man, I say, who in this age of ours attempts to force down the throats of Churchmen any particular formula upon a given doctrine! The doctrine is eternal; the words in which we express it may change and alter. I only used those words, not because they were my conviction, though they were so, but because they were words which a court of law—the second to the highest in England—had adjudicated, and decided that they were words which could be used in the Church of England, and that the man who did use them was not thereby liable to penal prosecution. That was simply my motive in doing it—to express what a court of law had decided a man might say in our Church

in opposition to the very extreme views which had been expressed on the other side. Now, I am quite conscious that in that phrase—for no one could have gone through the series of controversies in which I have been involved without having considered it most carefully—there are two expressions which seem to convey to the mind something which I did not mean to convey, and many people have said that I hold a view which I do not hold, and have attributed to me doctrines which I do not believe in.

I take up, first of all, the words, "under the form of bread and wine." Let me ask if there are not members in this House who have held that when a man says he believes in the presence of Christ in the elements under the form of bread and wine, he really means that the form of bread and wine remains while the substance is gone and another substance has taken its place. In other words, I believe there are those in this House who think that the words, "under the form of bread and wine," definitely teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, and I am compelled to admit that they have been used to express at some time in history the doctrine of transubstantiation. I am also free to say that the words have been used over and over again in the Church of England to express not the doctrine of transubstantiation, but the doctrine of the real spiritual presence of Christ our Lord in sacramental union with the consecrated elements. Those words are to be found in an advertisement annexed to the first Book of Homilies. It says, "Hereafter shall follow homilies upon the Ascension, the Nativity, and the right receiving the blessed Body and Blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine." I know people have said that that title has no authority. I know that they make the statement that it was introduced by that extraordinary person the King's printer. I know that they also correctly add that when the second Book of Homilies appeared, the homily upon the Lord's Supper did not bear that title; and yet the fact is that the Book of Homilies has been twice revised since this statement was put in, and it has never been altered, and is to this day to be found in the advertisement annexed to the First Book of Homilies of the Church of England. I also must say that the words themselves were familiar to our reformers because they had been used by Bertram or Ratramnus in his treatise on the Lord's Supper, not in the sense of transubstantiation, but in the sense of the real presence. The words occur in a formal prayer set out by Queen Elizabeth after the Reformation, though they were afterwards dropped from that form in the year 1566. The words are to be found in varying senses in books like "Nicholson on the Catechism," "Sherlock's Practical Christian," "Sutton's Godly Meditations upon the most Holy Supper of the Lord"; and in our day they have been used by very many writers. In the famous argument, and an argument of unequalled power and eloquence, though it was on the wrong side, and though rumor says it converted the man who made it to the right side—I say that in the argument of Mr. Stephens before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, he distinctly asserted that the words "under the form of bread and wine" may be used to express the real presence of Christ in the elements, and that they did not necessarily mean or imply the doctrine of transubstantiation.

But what shall be said of the phrase "in the elements"? It is true that the Bennett formula, as it is sometimes called, did not use the words "in the elements." It used the words "in the Sacrament." So I was accused of having corrupted and perverted the Bennett judgment in order to express something

more strongly than he did. I took the opportunity of writing a letter to a gentleman who holds a distinguished position in the Church of England, Mr. Walter Phillimore, the son of Sir Robert Phillimore, the judge who pronounced the judgment; and he wrote back to me that I had quoted it exactly; and while it was true that the words "in the Sacrament" were the words of Mr. Bennett, for the purposes of the legal decision in this case the words "in the elements" and the words "in the Sacrament" were exactly identical.

And now, because I said "I believe in the presence in the elements," people held that I must believe in a local, physical, carnal presence in the elements. Let me say that it is impossible for me to say in what sense I hold to a presence in the elements. Where Christ has not defined, I do not define. Where the Church has not defined, I do not define. I merely say negatively, as the Church has said that it is not by transubstantiation; that it is not by impanation; that it is not by identity of substance; and if you ask me how it is, I answer I know of but one word to express it, and that word expresses it without defining it, and that word is the consecrated word "sacramental." I hold that Christ is in sacramental union with the consecrated elements, and that presence is called "real," to show that it is not a mere figurative or virtual presence, and the presence is called "spiritual" to show that it is not a physical or carnal or corporeal presence. Having made these negative definitions, I declare that I hold that Christ has ascended into the heavens, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God. I hold that around him are the angels and the powers and the principalities, the cherubim and seraphim, and that the hymn of praise to the Eternal King ever ascends; and I also hold that He is present in the elements by this way of sacramental union; and how both are true I can not tell. I believe the one and I believe the other just as I believe in God's predestination and in man's free will, and am neither a Calvinist nor an Arminian, because I accept both sides of the truth. I hold that Christ is there (pointing to the sky); I hold that He is here; I hold that He is there locally; I hold that He is here spiritually.

Mr. President and gentlemen, I have a great deal more to say, but I had no idea that I could be so verbose; and now you must be tired to death. ["Go on! go on!"] Mr. President, I want to read something, and I want to say beforehand that it is not my own, so that nobody need quote it against me. [Laughter.] These words are (they are in the form of prayer): "How Thou art in heaven and art present on the altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all because Thou hast said it; and I firmly rely on Thy love and Thy omnipotence to make good Thy word, but the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend."

And those are the words of the saintly Bishop Ken, who wrote the morning and the evening hymn which, for nearly two centuries, have tuned the morning prayers and the evening supplications of the children of our branch of God's Holy Church.

Mr. President, I am anxious to read one other extract, and I especially read it for the benefit of my brethren from Connecticut. I myself belong to Connecticut. I was born there and trained there, and the man who wrote this was the man who catechised me in my boyhood upon the faith of the Church. I love Connecticut with its hills and its vales and its blue river, and more than that do I love its grand old names and its noble history, and I trust that the day is far distant, I know the day is far distant, when Connecticut Churchmanship shall become the synonym for intol-

erance or narrowness, or any sort of unchristianlike statesmanship, and the words that I am about to read are the words of Dr. Samuel Farmer Jarvis, one of the most honored Presbyters of this Church, the son of Bishop Jarvis, who began that apostolical succession of historiographers of the Church, which, after resting for awhile upon Dr. Hawks, now in its full glory has fallen upon our distinguished Secretary. I say the words are the words of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Farmer Jarvis, the first historiographer of this Church. They are to be found in a sermon on "Christian Unity necessary for the Conversion of the World," a sermon preached before the Bishops, clergy, and laity, of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the year 1836. When the Rev. Doctor preached this sermon, the Bishops and clergy were so delighted with it that they invited him to publish it the next year with notes, which accordingly he did in the year 1837, and so for some thirty-seven years this sermon has been before the Church and belongs to the Diocese of Connecticut. I want to read what this great divine says. After preaching as he had a good right to do, and as he ought to have done, against the errors of Rome, he puts in this note:

"As, on the one hand, we have no right to banish from our communion those whose notions of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament rise to a mysterious change, by which"—

Mark this language:

—"by which the very elements themselves, though they retain their original properties, are *corporally united with, or transformed into Christ*: so, on the other, they are not to be excluded who consider that real presence as altogether spiritual, but productive of the same blessed results, namely, the privileges of the Gospel resulting from the death of Christ."

And that passage, which is a note to the sermon, is to be found on the twenty-seventh page of this sermon on "Christian Unity necessary for the Conversion of the World," a sermon preached before the Bishops and clergy and laity constituting the Board of Missions. Let me say, my dear brethren, that I never in my life said anything as strong as that. Whatever I have said does not come at all up to Connecticut churchmanship. [Laughter.] If perchance I have imbibed some feeble idea of that which the Reverend Father from Connecticut taught, having been catechised by him when I was a boy, I trust that the House will pardon the succession that in that respect I have received from him.

And now hear I people asking the old rationalizing question, "How can Christ's body and blood be at the right hand of God, and how can it be at the same time in the Holy Eucharist?" and I find them explaining it away and saying that it is impossible that it can be in the Eucharist, because it is at the right hand of God. O Mr. President and gentlemen! I cannot explain mysteries. I do not pretend to do so. I can only speak of that which the Holy Scriptures say. You all remember when our Lord was speaking to Nicodemus before his body was glorified, he said, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." He did not say that the Son of God was in heaven. He actually said that the Son of man at that very moment when he was talking to Nicodemus was both talking to him and in heaven also; and "the Son of man" at that. If you can explain how these two things are true, possibly I may be able to explain also.

Let me call your attention also to the very remarkable fact of the conversion of St. Paul. Do you not remember that when St. Paul was going to Damas-

cus he fell to the earth, and a great light shined around about him, and he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" and the answer was, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." I dare say some persons may say he only saw a vision, but then we read immediately after that unto Ananias the Lord appeared in a vision. So when Ananias came to Saul he said that God had chosen him "that he should see that Just One and hear the voice of His mouth." And then we find that self-same St. Paul saying, "Am I not an Apostle? am I not free? Have I not seen the Lord Jesus Christ?" And then we find that same Apostle speaking on the resurrection, saying, He appeared first to James, and then to five hundred brethren, "and last of all He was seen of me also, as one born out of due time, who am not meet to be called an Apostle." And so St. Peter says that somehow or other it was necessary to a call to the apostleship that the man should see and hear the Lord Jesus Christ, because he says, in speaking about the election of Matthias, "One must be chosen to be a witness of the Lord's resurrection," and also to Cornelius, that "Him God raised up the third day and showed Him openly not to all the people but to witnesses chosen before of God even to us." And if any one will explain to me how it was possible for our Lord to be in heaven and be seen and heard by St. Paul, not in a vision, but actually and really, then I may be able to explain the mystery of the Holy Communion.

Now, I have only a word more to say. My explanation, which is not an explanation but only the bringing forth of a great and true doctrine, is that it is the mission of God the Holy Ghost not to supply Christ's absence, but to accomplish His presence. I know that people hold that the Holy Ghost is God's vicegerent upon earth; I know that people have been bold enough to affirm that Christ is absent personally from this world; that in other words this world of ours is like the sepulchre, and we, like Mary Magdalene, are left to cry, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." It is not so. It is, I say, the mission of God the Holy Ghost not to supply Christ's absence, but to accomplish His presence. Blessed are the words which say, "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you." That seems to imply that the Holy Ghost was to take Christ's place; but then when the broken hearts of the Apostles seemed to say, "Give not Thou us any Comforter; we need no comforter but Thee," He replied to their thought, "I go away, and come again unto you." "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." "Yet a little while and ye see me no more; but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." These words indeed applied first to His return after the resurrection, they also apply to that blessed supplying of His presence which is the definite work of God the Holy Ghost, and which He accomplishes chiefly, though not exclusively, in the sacrament of the Holy Communion.

Mr. President, we live in troublous times, and around us are all sorts of terrible questions. It does seem to me the day is not now to legislate on nice points of doctrine, or to prescribe exactly the measure of a genuflexion or the angle of inclination which can express an orthodox devotion. The answer to all this panic and all this outcry is one, and one only. It is work; work for the cause of Christ; work for the souls of men; a fuller, deeper, more noble sense of the obligation of the Church, developing its

powers, and sending it forth to mould and form this nation of ours, and to give new life and vigor to every effort it makes for the salvation of men. I see the storm-cloud gathering; I see the lightnings flash; I hear the thunder roll afar; I hear the trumpet call; in my ears the bugle blast is ringing; and I call you, brethren, in a time like this, not to narrow-hearted legislation, but to broad, catholic, tolerant charity, and to work, as never men worked before, for the souls of those for whom the Saviour died.

I now offer the amendments. I have written them out, and I propose that these amendments be referred to the Committee on Canons for their consideration; and that motion includes the proposed substitute of Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland.

The Secretary read the amendments proposed by Rev. Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin, and Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I did not understand the Rev. Deputy from Wisconsin as pressing for a vote on that motion now. Of course, if a vote be taken, and it be sent to the Committee, it would take the whole matter from the House.

The PRESIDENT. Of course the other matter would have to be recommitted.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It is to be acted on when the House comes to a vote.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Convention of the Lower House: I stand here this afternoon at a very great disadvantage. I come to this debate with your minds already impressed by the elaborate argument which you have just heard; your convictions, certainly your feelings, swayed by the eloquence of the gifted speaker who has preceded me. I am not prepared to swear in the words of that master, but if any master could carry me to that side of the question which he holds, or is reported to hold, I know of none more powerful, none more attractive. He has spoken to you with a commanding eloquence. I think you will all agree with me that we have never been stirred during this session as by his appeal. He has brought to his argument a skill which perhaps he will pardon me when I say enables him almost, possibly wholly, "to make the worse appear the better reason." And he has brought a learning, too, which, without preparation on this floor, and without such special preparation as he has evidently made, I will not venture to meet. I say this in all frankness because I propose to speak truth, which possibly may not quite be so palatable by and by. I shall not go directly to the argument of this case—I mean to the doctrinal argument in this case. That has been put before you with a greater or less fullness and accuracy, and I know that other speakers will succeed me who will direct themselves especially to this point.

I desire rather to discuss the question in a certain broad, general way. But before going on to that I wish to make one or two remarks with regard to the argument which you have just heard. We have indeed listened not to an argument touching the immediate question before us except in the most indirect way. We have listened rather to a learned and eloquent exposition of the doctrine of the Presence in the Holy Eucharist and of Eucharistic adoration; and I take this opportunity to say that I am glad that my reverend brother from Wisconsin has been enabled to make the explanation with which his speech has closed. I think it will put him on clearer ground and higher ground, both in the intellectual esteem and in the hearts of his brethren. I for one give him all credit for his words. I believe that not only in gentlemanly courtesy, but by right of Christian authority, he can demand of every one of us that we ac-

cept his words, so far as he is concerned, as conclusive on this point.

But, as I have said, I do not propose to address myself especially, primarily, chiefly to the doctrinal argument involved in this matter. I assume that the great proportion of this body is agreed that the Church does not hold certain doctrines with regard to the Eucharist which I charge, and I think I shall be able to show, are held by those among us, and on the other side of the Atlantic, who are known distinctly as Ritualists. The only point I shall speak to is the point touching the expediency of the present action.

In order, however, to reach this point, it will be necessary to ask your attention to one or two preliminary matters. The question meets us as we endeavor as a Church to legislate in this matter; it is urged against us with a certain spirit sometimes of mockery, "What do you mean by a Ritualist? What is Ritualism?" This certainly, as we all know, is a most unfortunate word, and I do not propose this afternoon any definition of what is Ritualism, for, as I shall endeavor presently to show, the peril of the thing is its very vagueness; but I propose to answer this question—I think I can answer it—"What do you mean, what does the great majority of the men and women of the Church mean, by Ritualism?" I know the term has been defined, or attempted to be defined, after this fashion. A clerical wit on this side of the water has told us that Ritualism is that to which we are not accustomed. Mr. Gladstone has given the same definition, in almost the same words, on the other side of the Atlantic. The trouble is, however, and the secret of the power of this system is, that it is so vague, so undefined, and so undefinable. If it were well defined, if we could put it within sharp limits, then it would be easy at once to frame a Canon and to bring this thing to justice; but I can tell you that it is the very vagueness of the thing that makes it so hard to deal with, and it is this very vagueness which renders it so dangerous.

But, sir, if I cannot tell you in any clear, brief, succinct statement what Ritualism is, I think I can tell you, as I have promised, what we mean by Ritualism. There is no question among us that the Church has given large liberty to her children in this matter of ritual. As in regard to her doctrine so in her Ritual she allows for divergencies of temperament, and enables her children, so long as they do not infringe her doctrine or her law, to be gratified in those particulars. I believe that there is a large range allowed between the bald on the one side and the ornate on the other. I believe that this is a necessity in the very nature of things. I believe that God put these varieties of temperament into men, and I believe that the Church but responds (stands over and against) to this arrangement, this creation, this adaptation of God, when she allows to men having these different temperaments, variety in regard to Ritual. But as in doctrine she allows no opinion which touches vital truth, concerning which she has decided it, so she opposes the self-same limitation in regard to Ritual, and it is very important in this matter.

I maintain that the Ritual teaching of the Church is in many respects its strongest teaching. If no other particulars were brought in this remains, that it is a constant teaching; that it teaches a large mass of persons who perhaps could not take hold intellectually of simple doctrinal statements. It brings them physically, so to speak, into the possession of doctrine, and it does so constantly.

Then, remember, Ritualism so-called is not now, as at first, a matter of taste or of simple elaborateness or ornateness in Ritual observance. It is

now confessedly and distinctly a system of doctrine. We can all remember the budding of the system. That tiny flower was innocent, and they perhaps thought it so at the time; but we have seen how it has gone on day by day, and year by year, until at length it disclosed its crimson bosom, and is now exhaling poison, as I believe, throughout the Church. This is a part of its danger. It is the policy of this system in the Church to advance gradually and stealthily to its object. In support of that point I wish to read the following extract from an authority on this subject. The process is thus recommended:

"Let a gradual change be brought in. A Choral service, so far as Psalms and Canticles are concerned, on some week-day evening, will train people to like a more ornate worship, and that which began as an occasional luxury will soon be felt a regular want, where there is monthly Communion let it be fortnightly, where it is fortnightly let it be weekly, where it is weekly let a Thursday office be added. Where all this is already existing, candlesticks with unlighted candles may be introduced; where these are already found, they may be lighted at evensong; where so much is attained, the step to lighting them for the Eucharistic office is not a long one. Where the black gown is worn in the pulpit on Sundays, let it disappear in the week. The surplice will soon be preferred, and will oust its rival. It is easy for each reader to see that some advance, all in the same direction, can be made, and that without any offence taken."

Now observe the point which I make with this illustration. I am not at all speaking concerning the particulars there referred to. I simply want to bring out the policy pursued by this body, not only witnessed to by this quotation, but acknowledged on all hands, that they are to go on by degrees, as we have seen them go on step by step, until they reach their end.

My brethren around me have been looking at the title of the book from which I have just read. I brought it here for convenience only, and the title is "Facts and Testimonies touching Ritualism," by Oxoniensis; and allow me to say, in order possibly to satisfy some doubt in the mind of my friend from Illinois (Mr. Otis), or to answer some question that may arise, that I have taken in nearly every instance the advice of the venerable Dr. Routh to one of his scholars, "always verify your references." They have been verified.

Now, I go on and ask what do I mean by Ritualism. I answer, first of all, symbolism which involves and teaches false doctrine, whether it be in ornaments or in ceremonies. I need not go into any specifications of this matter. We all know that of the elevation of the elements and the genuflections. In order to illustrate this point, allow me again to quote from this book. The quotation is from the examination before the Ritual Commissioners in 1867. The questions are asked by the Archbishop of Armagh:

"Is there any mysterious signification in the chasuble, or in wearing it? That is a question which involves doctrine. If I am to be launched into doctrine, of course that again will involve an immensely long discussion.

"Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest? Yes.

"In fact *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest? Distinctly so.

"What authority have you in the Prayer Book for that? That again would involve a long answer,

"Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice? Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice."

Now I say that here in this kind of Ritual we have certain acts which involve distinctly and inevitably doctrine. It has been said, for example, that the symbolism of incense does not involve doctrine; we have been told that it implies simply the ascending and the offering of prayer. If we read one of the great authorities on the subject of Ritual, a work entitled the "Ritual Reason Why," we have this distinct answer—I do not vouch for the correctness of the answer, observe—"We very often use incense because we intend to signify and offer sacrifice." My reverend brother from Wisconsin may not hold that view; of course if he says so he does not hold it; I am speaking of the system, and I am speaking of the large number of men who hold that view. It is true they differ. They differ from the writers of the Old Testament that have been quoted. Then the simple answer is, so much the worse for the writers of the Old Testament!

What I mean by Ritualism is, again, where we have a correct and positive teaching, whether from the pulpit or in books, concerning Ritual and concerning Ritualistic devotion. Nay, Mr. President, I go further than this. I maintain that Ritualism is to be thwarted because it involves the adoption of a dress and ceremonial which has come to be regarded as the livery of the Church of Rome. I know the sneer which this brings out continually. If anything is essential to the truth, then I maintain that we are to hold it and to defend it against all the world; but certainly these things are not essential to the truth, and therefore being not essential I maintain that we have a right to consider the effect which they will have upon those of our Church who are using these forms of worship. The Roman Ritual is the true expression of Roman doctrine. If I believed, as the Romanist does, that Christ was corporeally present on the altar, locally there, then I hold that everything that can give grandeur and beauty, all physical expressions witnessing to a physical fact, are allowable, and not only allowable, but that they are within our bounden duty to provide and to observe. But this Ritual system, as I might again show from this work from the hands of a Ritualist in England, borrowed, and admittedly borrowed, from the Church of Rome in many of its ornaments and many of its ceremonies, means nothing with us, and can mean nothing with us, unless it means Roman doctrine. In other words, I maintain the one system is consistent in all its parts, and I maintain that the other is inconsistent unless you hold the doctrine in the latter which is held in the former. You say that all this is not Roman but Catholic. I deny it, if the rule and test of Catholicity is the Canon of Vincent of Lerins.

But, Mr. President, what is the simple, natural effect of all this? I maintain it is to damage the Church and to bar its progress. I pass on, however, to consider certain objections which are made to any attempt to interfere with this new heresy in the Church. It is often said, "Let it alone; it will die out itself; do not agitate the Church." Very well, it is worth while to ask, in the first place, by whom this is said. I answer, first, by those clergymen and laymen who from their position are not brought directly into contact with the system, and know it only by mere rumor or hearsay. This is an honest objection, and I can understand it. I can understand how a large number of our clergy, scattered through the country, for the most part in humble parishes where simple tastes prevail, are uninformed concerning this Ritualism, and why they do not fear it. They suppose that it is simply,

as I have said, some mere matter of taste, something which belongs by natural right as well as ecclesiastical right to the individual, and therefore they do not see any necessity for legislation; but, dear brethren, the clergy in our large cities know that it is something more than mere taste. The clergy not infected with this doctrine here in the city of New York and in my own city of Philadelphia know that Ritualism is something more than a matter of mere taste. They know that it is in their parishes; that it breaks down their influence, that it thwarts their teaching, which they have all along believed to be the simple teaching of the Church. They know that it endeavors to draw away their children. They know it endeavors to bring their communicants out of the confines of their own parish to confession and to the reception of absolution in parishes to which they do not belong. Therefore, while this objection is an honest one, I do maintain that it is a mistaken one; and if there are any members of this House unwilling to touch this measure of legislation because they hold it is not worth while to interfere with Ritualism, then I tell them they are making a mistake, because they are not properly informed. But this cry of "Let it alone; do not agitate the Church" is said also by Ritualists themselves and those in sympathy with them. If any member of this Convention should go to his home and find it broken into, the incendiary, the robber, the murderer, entering into his chosen places, imperilling his family, what would he say? How much attention would he give to them if the robbers and the incendiaries were to cry, "Do not agitate the family; do not disturb the household"?

But it is further worth while to ask, How long are we to let this Ritualism alone? Has Ritualism died out under being let alone? I know that it has not largely multiplied its churches in this country; but in the first place, as I have just said, it has spread its influence into parishes, creating disturbance and unrest, defying rectors and defying Bishops. In the next place it silently distributes and scatters abroad its poisonous literature. We all know, I suppose, the character of that literature. Allow me to read one or two passages in regard to it, taken from a work entitled "The Invocation of Saints and Angels," edited by Rev. Orby Shipley, a man well known among Ritualists. Here we find these words:

"Blessed Mary, Mother of God, Ever-Virgin, through whose fulfilment of all righteousness thy Divine Son was circumcised, and became obedient to the Law for man—Pray for us."

I supposed the fulfilment of all righteousness belonged only to Christ; I have always been taught that that was His attribute; and yet here, under the teaching of this system which comes into my parish and defies all my efforts, are prayers not only addressed to "Blessed Mary, Mother of God, Ever-Virgin," but I have this doctrine taught, that she also fulfilled all righteousness. That is one single illustration. Take another:

"Grant, O Lord God, we beseech Thee, that we Thy servants may enjoy continual health of mind and body; and by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary, Ever-Virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows and have the fountain of everlasting joy."

I ask you, is this the doctrine which we are prepared to receive into the Church? Are we to be met with the argument "Let it alone; do not stop it"? So I might go on with an endless number of quotations gathered in this work, which would show the character of the literature which this system, though there be not one single member of this Convention attached to it, having its agents all around us, is endeavoring to propagate in the Church,

At all events remember—since the declaration of my brother from Wisconsin I almost feel inclined to leave out the words, but I utter them for what they are worth, inasmuch as others were concerned behind him and perhaps misunderstood him—doubtless did misunderstand him as I have misunderstood him—this thing which we call Ritualism, which is not to be stopped, has grown stronger and so increased as almost to have obtained possession of two Dioceses in the Church.

But we are met with another objection. It is now the popular cry, we hear it on every side, "Toleration, Toleration." Truly this is a good thing, and, let it be confessed, not too common. I believe in toleration as much as any man. It is a good thing, I say, though it comes from strange lips and from strange quarters. The men who have been marked as most intolerant in the Church, now when their hour of trial comes, raise this cry of "toleration." But I ask you to consider what is this thing which we call toleration? Toleration, like liberty itself, implies limitation. It is a question, after all, of limits. To attempt to put a limit to certain things is not to be intolerant in regard to them. Unlimited toleration, on the other hand, is the offspring of indifference and the mother of lawlessness. These men may talk now about toleration and peace, but we know the meaning of the words and the fact. It is to break down the walls of our Zion; it is to spread ruin on every side; it is to continue, while we have no legislation, strife and trouble. *Solitudinum faciunt pacem appellant.*

But it is said, again, we cannot legislate in this matter by Canon. This is the great argument. We have heard it urged by my reverend brother from Louisiana. We have heard it accepted by my reverend brother the Deputy from Alabama, who has brought the Canon into this House. I ask you, then, to consider this position in itself, that this Church cannot legislate concerning this matter by Canon. We cannot, it is true, change, add to, or take from the Prayer-Book or its Rubrics by Canon; but I do maintain that we can interpret and define, we can say what the Rubrics or the Prayers mean, and where their limitations are to come in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (Rev. Dr. Burgess, of Massachusetts, in the chair). The gentleman's time has expired. ["Go on!" "Go on!"] It is moved that the Deputy from Pennsylvania have leave to proceed without reference to time.

Leave was granted.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Permit me, sir, to use an illustration in support of this view. As we all know, the last General Convention in the Upper House put forth in a Pastoral a declaration on the doctrine of the Baptismal Office. In other words, they did not add to the faith of the Church, but they did, as they had a right to do, define that faith; and I maintain if it was in the power of that Upper House, as I hold it was, thus in fact to legislate in this sense of the word "legislation," concerning doctrine, *a fortiori*, the whole General Convention has a right to define the Church's Rubrics in regard to this matter of Ritual. The Reverend Deputy from Alabama has told us that the only authority that can speak in this matter is the apostolic body; that the Bishops are the persons to speak; that we have not had and can have no authority. I believe that I have read somewhere of a primitive practice, "the apostles and brethren." But, after all, what does this objection really amount to? I ask you to observe the position, and what it really is. It comes to this: The General Convention has no power by Canon to forbid these things manifestly and confessedly above and be-

yond the Rubrics; but any single rector on his own individual motion has a right to use any or all of them as he pleases. But it is said you cannot legislate authoritatively. Doubtless, if a man chooses to evade the law, he can evade the law. I might read from this paper, did I not wish to spare the attention of the House, how from the lips of a Ritualist it can be shown how the law can be evaded. Any man can evade the law if he pleases, and yet there is an advantage of legislation, and there are many advantages. In the first place, this clear putting forth of the law rallies all loyal subjects and citizens. In the next place, it puts disloyalty at an open public disadvantage. When men enter upon these practices which teach, as we believe, false doctrine in the Church, and when they tell us, as we have heard to-day, that there is no definition, and therefore they are at liberty to do just as they please, and we meet them by this legislation, I say it puts them at once at disadvantage. In the third place, it rids this Church of ours of odium and responsibility. If, after it has declared itself, the individual members, whether clergy or laymen, choose to go on in their ways, then they stand rebels; the Church at least is free from the odium of their conduct. In the next place, it gives to the Bishops the necessary authority. And lastly, it gives to the rectors, and that is what I want, a clear line of action before them and the law behind them.

In almost every parish, in our larger parishes certainly, there is a certain restless element, usually the young, caught by the glitter of this new thing, carried away by the form of eccentricity, won by the very newness of it, who are for ever endeavoring to force forward their rectors. It is sometimes urged that this whole matter of Ritualism is something to be laid at the doors of the clergy. It is to be laid in many cases at the doors of this little, restless, disloyal, turbulent, defiant faction. Just as they will plead for a Bishop provided their Bishop obeys, so they will stand by their rector provided the rector yields to their demands. If he does not, then certainly he will find trouble. Now, sir, I want this legislation for the sake of the rectors.

Lastly, we are threatened with the civil courts. There is a great deal that might be said on this matter looking at it from a simple legal aspect, but I have exhausted the patience of the House, and I will simply make this remark: The Church, I think, will take that risk.

Now, sir, I have done. I proposed to read some passages illustrative of the following remark, but I forbear. I for one am not ashamed to be called a Protestant, I am a Protestant because first of all I am a Catholic. Just as the germ of primitive doctrine was expanded in its expression to meet on this side and on that side the heretics of the early age, so out of this term "catholic" comes in this modern age as against Rome the necessity of this term "Protestant," and I repeat it, I am Protestant because I am Catholic. I maintain that I could not be Catholic if I were not Protestant. I am not one of those who sneer at the dark ages, when the darkness perhaps is, to a very considerable extent at least, in their own ignorance. I am willing to admit all the good that was done by the Church, its conservation of letters, its care of the poor, standing between the nobles of the feudal system and those whom they endeavored to grind under their feet; but, sir, I am also not one of those *laudatores temporis actis* who are led to trust simply and solely in the past, and to deny the good of the present. Yes, sir, I am Catholic and I am Protestant. I love this free air around us; I know what this liberal mind has done; and I am opposed to Ritualism because I conscientiously believe that this sys-

tem—I am not speaking of individuals, God forbid—but this system, it is a fact, and it cannot be denied to be a fact, tends to carry us back, not to any possible good in the past, but to its false doctrine, to its bad ritual, and to its bad morals.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. It is with a great deal of diffidence that I bring myself to say a word on the subject, especially after following gentlemen of such eloquence and distinction. But believing, as I do, that this question is, of all questions that come before this House, peculiarly a question for the laity, I ask permission to say a few words on the subject.

I shall most heartily vote for this Canon as reported by the Committee in its present shape, although, as I indicated by a question I asked of the clerical gentleman from Alabama, I think it ought to be amended; but if the amendment is not submitted—and I shall not move it—I will most heartily vote for the Canon as reported. Why do I say this? I must confess that it does not contain much which I hoped it might contain, and which I hoped the experience of the past few years would have caused the insertion of; but as a friend of mine said to me a short time ago, "At least, it squints in the right direction, and do not lose the whole by demanding too much at once." I heartily respond to this; but still I would much prefer that this Committee, if it were recommended to them, would at least make to the laity one small concession. In the second section, instead of reading as it now does: "Or on complaint made to him, in writing, by two or more of his Presbyters," it would just drop out those last words, so as to read, "If any Bishop have reason to believe," etc. With that we should be content. I hope, at least, that such will be granted to the laity.

Now, if the reverend gentleman from Wisconsin were to guide the discussion, probably he would maintain that I was no proper person, according to my doctrines, to be a member of this Church, and that I should not be allowed to be here even as a layman. This Convention will probably be surprised when I avow myself here a Ritualist to all intents and purposes; a Ritualist of a certain sort, and only of a certain sort—a Ritualist who would stand by the Prayer-Book—for this reason above every other reason: that this Ritual has stood so long and so sturdily, and our Church is so adapted to it, that it is the Ritual of the Church which brings me more closely to it.

But what is it that the gentlemen claim as Ritual? Is it in truth and fact so? It is not something that the Prayer-Book calls so; it is not something that we, the common people, understand. Is it not directly in the teeth of our Twenty-fourth Article of Religion? That Article is very short, and I will read it:

"Article XXIV. Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the people understandeth.

"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people."

My objection to this thing, characterized as Ritual, is that it is preaching the Gospel, and everything that should be done in a plain tongue, in an unknown tongue to the people. We have been told, and most forcibly, that they teach to the young, to the ignorant, to the body of the people, more effectively by their acts than by their words. Mr. President, it is said God gave us the Gospel, but the father of lies gave us theology. [Laughter.] This, to all intents and purposes, is a question of theology. It is admitted by every one who has spoken to be a question of theology. Recollect, then, God being the

author of the Gospel, theology relies on the father of lies. I do not mean to say that theology is a system of lies. God forbid that I should have any such notion as that—I mean false theology. What I say is, that take any system of theology, and how easy it is for any Presbyter or Deacon, as things now stand in this Church, to preach falsehood without control! I am perfectly willing on this and almost every other subject to leave the matter either to the House of Bishops, or to a committee of the House of Bishops, or to a committee of the common body of the clergy of our Church, not taking the extremes on either side, to instruct the people on the subject of theology. In other words, if you have a limitation on all these rites and ceremonies, let us take it on the faith either of the Bishops or of a committee of the clergy, but let us have some guarantee from some source, not from the individual action of any Presbyter or Deacon, that the practices which he uses does not symbolize something that is unprovoked, that is wrong, but let us be certain that his practices are not such as disturb us, and that they are not so varied that when a man accustomed to worship in the Protestant Episcopal Church in one Diocese goes to another—he has to hang his head in shame, for not understanding the service of his Mother Church.

For these reasons, while the Canon is not perfect, and while I would agree to some of the valuable suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, I shall vote for it just as it is, and shall offer no amendment.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, the distinguished Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin told you he believed that he was the only Clerical Ritualist in this House. I tell you now that I come before you as perhaps the only Lay Ritualist in this House, and yet I came to this Convention to represent the Diocese of Massachusetts. I believe I am only here to represent the Church, the Broad Church, the High Church, the Low Church, and even the Ritualist I am allowed to speak for, and I may have been sent here because I think I know something about Ritualism.

Who is it that objects to Ritualism? Is it the New Yorkers? Where are the Ritualist churches in this country? They are here in New York, and what do we find here? We find two hundred gentlemen of New York praying that you will have no legislation on the subject. Sir, I never heard that there was any Ritualism within a thousand miles of Virginia. I believe there may be just one Ritualistic church in the whole of Maryland. There is but one so called in the whole of New England. There is one, I believe, in Philadelphia. I think these are all that exist. I do object to this way of combating the party, if it be so. I know something about Ritualism. I have been a worshipper in a church called a Ritualistic church for four years, and yet I utterly deny that there is any such thing as a Ritualistic party. There are individuals, and among those who are called Ritualists there are a great many foolish individuals. Sir, I object wholly to the testimony of such a man as the Rev. Orby Shipley being brought here to represent the views of a party. He is a dilettante; he is no fixed clergyman of any cure. He amuses himself with translating Romish books of devotion, and making utterances of that sort to frighten people; but he represents no one.

I tell you I know something about Ritualism. I am a member of a free church, and have been for some years. That church was vacant four years ago, and, being Senior Warden and the Chairman of the Committee, it be-

came my duty to enquire how I should find such a clergyman as would go on and preach the Gospel to the poor most effectually. It was not a church for rich men; it was a church for poor men. I wanted a clergyman who would go into the highways and byways of the city, into the houses of the poor, and carry the Gospel directly to them. Being in England, I was there at the time of the English Mission, and I enquired into this mission, and who started it. They had been spoken of as the brothers of St. John the Evangelist; the Cowley Fathers they are sometimes called. This is an association for preaching the Gospel to the poor. They have two objects. One is an object of missions, which is a sort of Methodist revival, if you please. This is a thing which has been done in the Roman Catholic Church, which has been done in the Methodist Church, which has been done in the Congregational Church. It is a setting apart a season of three, eight, or ten days, in which there are to be frequent services, great prayer, one or two sermons every day, where the congregation are invited to go for their own spiritual welfare and to pray for sinners. The object is to convert people. Conversion is a cardinal doctrine with some of these Ritualists.

I know a great many people are afraid of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and say that High-Churchmen do not hold to conversion. Perhaps the old High-Churchmen do not, but I tell you these Ritualists do. There is my lay brother from Pennsylvania (Mr. Welsh). He knows I have a design on him, and that is a design to put him into a retreat, and when we get him into a retreat and keep him there four or five days, and let him see no one of the world, keep out every newspaper and letter from him, and make him give his whole heart and soul to devotion to God, I do not think he will exactly like it. It is a pretty hard thing for him, but what shall we say to him? Convert him; he will be better hereafter. Will he say that he would convert me? He would not say that, for he is a modest man, but we all know him. I take him as an extreme instance. Who in this Church has been more faithful to preaching the Gospel to the poor? Who has been more zealous for the poor Indian than he? Who has been more abounding in good works? We will get him in this retreat, and put a question of this sort to him: How many of those people who built Noah's ark afterwards got into it and were saved? And, I tell him, we trust in his works, and therefore we will try to convert him again. [Laughter.]

That is the doctrine we preach to high and low, rich and poor, and that is one of the reasons why Ritualism is so very unpopular. Sir, in the church to which I belong people come and say, "Yes, we like your good service, but we do not like your hell-fire preaching." [Laughter.] That is exactly what they say. Many years ago we had a Calvinist congregation where the highest Calvinism was preached, and it was always known and spoken of as Brimstone Corner. There came from Sicily a cargo of brimstone to Boston, and the supercargo found it very difficult to dispose of that cargo. He asked here, and he asked there, till finally one man said: "Sir, there is Dr. Britton who lives in Park Street, he is the largest dealer in brimstone in the whole city of Boston; go to him." [Laughter.] The supercargo actually went to him and said: "Sir, I am told by your fellow-citizens that you deal more largely in brimstone than anybody else in this city, and I have got a splendid cargo to offer to you." [Laughter.] He could only say, "My poor man, how they have fooled you!" [Laughter.] I hope that we shall get you all to Boston at the next meeting, and I think we will show you a little Ritualism,

and a little of the changes that have taken place. If a man should come to Boston now with a cargo of brimstone, he could go to the Ritualistic Church of the Advent, and offer it, for it is known that those doctrines are most loudly and constantly preached there; but if a man came on a fast horse he would be very likely to go to the minister of that very parish whose predecessor was supposed to deal largely in brimstone.

Now, simply as a layman, I have not come to talk about theology; I know nothing about it. I only come to you because, as I tell you, when I was in search of a clergyman for this parish, I determined to take the medicine myself. I am a medical man, and therefore when I prescribe to patients I am expected to know something personally about the sort of medicine I give them, and I subjected myself to their teaching, and having studied the subject thoroughly, having sent another member of our corporation, a man well known, Hon. Richard H. Denny, Jr., to England, to look into the subject also, we put our parish under the Cowley Fathers, and finally we chose Father Grafton as the rector, and I can tell you we have never repented the choice. Never was our work so fully carried out of getting hold of poor people, and we find in that the advantage of Ritualism.

One reason why my brethren from the country parishes are so much afraid of this Ritualism is that they do not understand the needs of the cities. It is in the cities where the crime and ignorance and folly of the country are collected. We have to deal with the young men who have left the parental home—who have lost all the reverence of childhood—who have no one to advise them. We have young women who are collected in shops, workwomen with no mothers, no father to go to, no home. They live in boarding-houses. We can get hold of these through the instrumentality of Ritualism.

And then I want to bring forward another dreadful subject—that of confession. It seems to me as if every member of this House expected that these dreadful Ritualists were going to drive him to the confessional. Many years ago I went to see a patient, and she said to me, "Why, doctor, I have had a visit from my clergyman." "Indeed," said I, "is that so rare?" "Yes," said she, "I have not seen him for two years." "Well," said I, "you go to hear him preach?" "Yes, every Sunday." "Well," said I, "why do you not treat me in the same way? I give lectures on pathology. It is my vocation. Why do you not come to hear me preach on pathology? Every time you have a headache or pain in your stomach, why do you not come and hear me lecture on that subject?" [Laughter.] Gentlemen, we do not deprecate preaching. It is a very important element with us, but we do not find it enough. We are going to have a mission in Boston this next week, and we shall have one of the ablest preachers of England to preach for us, and we attach a great deal of importance to preaching, but it is not all. We must get hold of the individuals, and we must establish such relations with them as will enable them to come to some competent person to tell their trials, to tell their temptations, to ask for counsel, to ask for assistance. Take these poor girls that I have spoken of. We have a sisterhood which came from England—the Sisters of East Brinsley. They have established a house.

In our Church we are a little careful not to keep our clergymen too high generally, but let them feel a little the burden of a wife and children. Having no clergyman's wife in our case, the mother of this sisterhood comes in and offers herself. She collects them in a Guild, and offers prayers and teach-

es them. My brother from Massachusetts can tell you how much we can teach by Ritual. We do a great deal of teaching by Ritual and teaching by kindness. We have not a consecrated building, and we worship in that very building where the distinguished preacher of Brooklyn, Henry Ward Beecher, was brought up. We worship in the building that was built for his father; and his father won a name in Boston which carried the war against Unitarianism that prevailed there. He had a great deal of influence, and made a great many conversions; and now we hope that in this very building built for him, when we have our mission there, we shall have a great many more conversions.

You speak of confession. I never confessed. Nobody likes to confess in a Ritualistic church. They tell to any man, "If you really have a besetting sin; if you are really weary, and the dangers of the city in these days are very great, come to us." The dangers for young people, for young women and young men, in cities are very great to those who live there without their parents, without relations, without friends to take care of them. They must have some friend to whom they can go—to whom they may explain; and those are the people whom we encourage to go to Confession, for something of the same reason that it is said about the Indians—this I read in a book about the Indians. It was found necessary to have some confession, because they were like children or young people. Confession is not so necessary for the educated and the refined, for those who live exempted from temptation; but take a young man or young woman, and put that young man or young woman fresh from the country into the city, and you expose them to all the perils and errors which are about there, and confession is a very valuable means for those. Confession we have in common with the Methodists. I know very well, gentlemen, that this distinction was once drawn by the Bishop of New Brunswick, who was travelling in a steamboat. There was a Methodist minister who was very anxious to get hold of him, because he said he had heard that confession was practised as much in the Methodist Church as it was in the Roman Catholic, and, finally, he went to him and said: "You have been charging us with confession being prevalent in the Methodist Church as well as the Roman Catholic Church. What do you mean by it?" "Well," said he, "I make a distinction." "Well," said the clergyman, "what is it?" "Why," said he, "Roman Catholics are more fond of confessing their faults, and the Methodists are more fond of confessing their virtues. [Laughter.] You know exactly how that is conducted in the Methodist Church. You know, too, in regard to the Congregationalists, that when revival meetings are held by the Congregationalists—for I was brought up in that way—it was not enough to have the preaching, but that Conference meetings and private meetings were held, and they endeavored to bring all the people into personal communication. The difficulty with the Methodists' communion is that they do not keep them so steady enough. The abuses of revivals in their system are matters which we try to guard against.

Now, having a parish of that sort, when people come to church, we endeavor to make the service as beautiful to them as we can. They have very little that is beautiful in their own homes. The mere poor have nothing. We have what we call the Lord's table. Now, I maintain that we have a great deal in this Canon about the respect paid to the Lord's table. Why should it not be respected? It is said of Bishop Butler that he never passed a church without taking off his hat, because he

said the Lord is there; it is the Lord's house. Are you going to tell us that when we spread the Lord's table, and invite the people there, the rich man may fill his table with lights and flowers, and with the most beautiful silver he can get, and put his servants in handsome clothes, and dress them all, and when these poor people come to the Lord's table, that is not to be ornamented?

When we do these things we do not mean any transubstantiation or consubstantiation; we mean reverence, and reverence is a hard thing for us Puritans in the North. It may be easier for my friends in Virginia and Maryland, in a warmer climate, to be reverent; but take any one of the old Plymouth Rock hard Puritan nature, and I tell you it is a very hard thing to teach him reverence, and we need these things to impress reverence. We are taught to reverence the Lord's house; we are taught to behave well in the Lord's house; we are taught simply to reverence the Lord's table, and if we put flowers on the table, and if we put lights on the table, we do not mean any system alien to the Church. As I said on another occasion to my venerable friend, Dr. Mead, the doctrine which is taught in our Church is precisely the doctrine which came from Connecticut, which came from our first rector. We have no new Eucharistic doctrine; we have tried to inculcate more reverence, for we are getting in people out of the Church, we are getting in young men and young women, and we are endeavoring to teach them in that way how to behave when they come into the Lord's house.

There is a doctrine of some sort of presence in the Church, but there are many people in the Church who do not believe in any sort of presence. There are people who are still intent on thinking there may be such a matter as superstitious reverence for holy places. I have heard it is the practice of clergymen in some places before they go up to the pulpit to put their outer garments on the Lord's table simply to show that they have no superstitious reverence for that table. Now I would not for the world have any Canon to force them to do otherwise. It may be their honest belief and their honest conviction. They are trying to express the truth. There is a danger. Nobody can deny that in Mexico, that in Italy, that in Roman Catholic countries, there is a great deal of superstitious reverence; but what I maintain in our country, in our own day, in our own generation, is that there is no danger of too much reverence in this America Church, and what we mean by this bowing to the Lord's table, by being reverent in the Lord's house, is simply to try to impress upon ourselves that there is a Lord who created us, and that He is a reality, and that He is something to us.

The PRESIDENT. The time has arrived for adjournment, and the House stands adjourned till tomorrow at nine o'clock.

—♦♦♦— EIGHTEENTH DAY.

TUESDAY, October 27.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. Edwin E. Johnson, of Connecticut. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. George Worthington, of Michigan. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. William Bacon Stevens, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

A message (No. 46) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in Message No. 35 of the House of Deputies as to fixing a place for the next General Convention, and names as the Committee on its part the Bishop of New York, the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania, and the Bishop of Massachusetts."

PAPERS IN REGARD TO DR. SEYMOUR.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. There is a question of privilege that I would ask a moment in regard to. I have been asked to give copies of certain letters that were read whilst we were considering the confirmation of the Bishop-elect of Illinois. I have them here, but, as I gave notice at the time, they are retained by me. If the House is willing to pass a resolution requesting the Secretary to give me copies of certain other papers, I will hand them over to the House to let it do just what it pleases with them. I move that the Secretary be authorized to give to a Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania copies of certain papers in his possession. Then I will instantly, if that passes, hand over all these papers to the custody of the House, in order that it may do with them just what it lists.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I suggest that the Deputy who asked for the delivery up to him of certain papers [Rev. Dr. Stringfellow] is not present; and let this be deferred until he is present and able to speak on the subject.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. He did not make the request for these papers; it came from another Deputy, belonging to this House, who is exceeding anxious to get them, in order that he may furnish Professor Seymour with a copy. I am not willing to part with them in any other way than the way indicated. There are other parties in interest. These papers really belong to three or four persons. I have obtained their consent to give them to the House on this condition and no other. My motion is that the Secretary be authorized to furnish a Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania with copies of certain papers in his possession.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. It strikes me that the motion, if carried, will defeat, in great part, the object of the secret session, which was for the very purpose of keeping our consultations away from the public. If these papers be given up, it would lead to a long newspaper correspondence, in all probability, which would not lead to edification. The papers belong to the House, as it seems to me, and ought to be retained by the House.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. In reference to the papers in the hands of the Deputy from Pennsylvania, I would say that I believe it is an act of injustice to the gentleman indicated implicated in these papers; that he should have a copy of them; and I do not think any consideration for the public ought to restrain us from doing that act of eminent justice to that gentleman; and I hope there will be no objection interposed by anybody in the way of putting those papers in such a position that the Secretary may, by the general consent of the House, without putting a formal motion, be permitted to give the gentleman copies.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That is all I ask; and I recognize in this gentleman a friend of Professor Seymour, and the very Deputy who made the appeal to me last evening. I think the House will all agree that he ought to have them; but I am not authorized to give them up except on these conditions. If it is understood by general consent that the Secretary has that authority and will recognize it, I ask for nothing else.

Rev. Dr. CHASE, of Illinois. This to me is a singular relation. I think we ought not to act in this matter until the Rev. Dr. Stringfellow is present. I understood him to move for an order of the House instructing the Secretary to return to him papers

which he had laid on the desk, not for the purpose of passing them into the possession of this House, but simply to enable individuals who might wish to examine them to go to the Secretary's desk and there examine them. The Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania has papers on the other side which he keeps in his pocket and refuses to deliver into the possession of the House. Therefore I think his motion is perfectly correct and an orderly one; but I wish the whole relation to be distinctly understood, whether there are certain papers on one side that are kept in the pockets of those who used them, and papers on the other side which were simply laid on the Secretary's desk, are declared to be the property of the House. So far as proprietorship is concerned, the papers on the one side are as much the property of the House as the papers on the other side.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary wishes to make a statement.

The SECRETARY. I wish to say that I have not given up the papers, but I do not know of any papers in the pocket of any gentleman, except those papers which were brought in by Dr. Chase himself early in the session. Mr. Welsh may have copies made before, but I have the originals of all the papers that came into my possession, and no one has them, or will have them, without an order of the House. The only papers not in my hands are those which Dr. Chase read, and one of the gentlemen of the Illinois Deputation, as coming from Dr. Seymour, or taken down by dictation from Dr. Seymour's mouth.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. I wish to ask if all the papers are to be made the property of the House, because I had some papers bearing on that question. I wish to know if the proposal now is that all the letters and questions which were read to the House are to be the property of the House?

The PRESIDENT. I really do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I think it an act of justice to all parties that those papers should be furnished. It is right that Dr. Seymour should have the papers. It is right that Bishop Cox should have whatever papers bear on the subject in reply. I had hoped the matter would be arranged without bringing it before the House; but as it has been brought here, I will simply say that Dr. Seymour desires to have official copies of any letters which were laid before the House during this session in any manner affecting his doctrinal character; and in his behalf I was requested to secure these papers. I ascertained that the Deputy from Pennsylvania had an original letter in his possession, which he will communicate to Dr. Seymour, only on the condition that the House will give to him official copies of the answers of Dr. Seymour to the charges there contained. I think that is entirely right; and if a formal resolution is necessary, I hope it will be passed, directing the Secretary to give copies.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I rise to offer an amendment to the resolution offered by the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania, and that is that the Bishop of the Diocese of Western New York, Rev. Dr. Seymour, and the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania, be allowed to have such papers as have been presented in the Seymour case, or may hereafter be presented, as may be necessary in order that these gentlemen may explain the position which they have taken in relation to this matter. It seems but an act of justice to Dr. Seymour on the one hand, and Bishop Cox on the other; but it seems that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who understands business better than some of us clergymen do, has certain things which he is willing to sell us at a certain price. I do not think we shall get them unless we pay the price. I think it is a great deal

better for us to pay the price than not have the papers. I move the amendment.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT. Will the Rev. Deputy from New Jersey reduce his amendment to writing?

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I will.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. It seems to me that this whole matter is entirely outside of the jurisdiction of this House. I do not see how it is possible to compel any member to give up private papers which he holds; and any action of this House on this subject is only carrying out a private agreement between parties. It seems to me that it should not have been introduced here. An amendment has just been offered to the resolution already offered by the gentleman on my left, that all papers hereafter presented on this subject shall also be delivered to the parties.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Only to three.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Allow me a word of explanation. I said "that should be necessary in order to their establishing the positions they had taken." That is the idea I intended to convey.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I mistook in that respect. But in regard to the other point it seems to me incontrovertible that these gentlemen can exchange their papers if they see fit, without the action of this House, as any action of this House cannot be mandatory upon them as to whether they will do it or not. They have come to this House to ask the consent of the House to make a private arrangement, which they do not need the consent of this House to make, as I understand. Mr. Welsh can, of course, deliver his papers upon receiving copies of those which he desires; and it seems to me that the House does not need to take any action on this subject at all.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The Secretary will not give them up without the action of the House.

Rev. Dr. CHASE, of Illinois. The point I wish to make is simply this. The motion of Rev. Dr. Stringfellow the other morning was strictly in order, as the papers he mentioned are properly his papers, and in his control. Any person making a speech under the circumstances Dr. Stringfellow did had a perfect right to use any paper that he chose as part of his speech, and it does not become by the use thus made of that paper the property of the House. It was precisely so in reference to the paper which I myself read. I still retain that in my possession. I am, however, perfectly willing to place myself at the discretion of the House. If they say that that paper is the property of the House, I shall at once deliver it into the hands of the Secretary; but I do not regard it as properly the property of this House. I regard precisely in the same relation the papers submitted by the Rev. Dr. Stringfellow, that they are his property; that when he laid them on the Secretary's table he did not part with the ownership of that property. It is true he had read the papers in the course of his speech, as part and parcel of his argument; but still he parted with no ownership in those papers. When he confided them to the Secretary's desk, the Secretary undoubtedly acted in perfect propriety in resolving to wait for the instructions of the House. The House ought yesterday to have instructed the Secretary to deliver them into his hands. That is the simple point I wished to make.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I was about to make a statement very similar to that which has been made, not from any immediate personal interest of my own, but because, happening to stand near Dr. Stringfellow at the time of his mo-

tion, he explained his wishes in some manner to me, and since he is not here present himself, I feel bound, as far as I may, to speak in his behalf.

I understood him distinctly to say that his request was not at all with reference in the first place to the letter of the Bishop of Western New York, but simply that he might reclaim the papers which he had read here and which were laid upon the Secretary's table, not to put them into the possession of the Convention, but that they might be at the time examined by members of the Convention who might wish to speak in the debate. Without referring to the letter of the Bishop of Western New York, he asked the House to instruct the Secretary, who had up to that time declined to do so, to return to him his papers. He said he had made application, and the Secretary said that he had no authority to deliver them. He therefore asked the House to instruct the Secretary to return the papers to him. He then on further suggestion consented to willingly leave them in possession of the Secretary, if the papers on the other side were also left there. That was a private arrangement. But all he asked of the House was to withdraw them.

The SECRETARY. I will read the endorsement on the papers presented by Dr. Stringfellow:

"Questions to and answers from Dr. Seymour, presented by Dr. Stringfellow."

To whom did Dr. Stringfellow present those papers, and why is this endorsement in his own handwriting?

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I have altered the phraseology slightly, and therefore I prefer to read the resolution myself, and explain why I altered it. Of course, it is for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to adopt it or not, as he pleases. He says, however, it is satisfactory to him:

"Resolved, That the Bishop of the Diocese of Western New York, the Rev. Dr. Seymour, and the Delegation from Pennsylvania"—

I have altered that from "delegate" to "delegation."

"be permitted to have copies of papers in the case of the Bishop-elect of Illinois, as may be necessary to establish positions taken by the several parties."

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I do not fully understand what has occurred, but it seems to me that the House should clearly understand what they are voting on before what I think is a very wrong precedent be established. As I understand the motion of the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey, it is that the originals are to be kept by the Secretary, and copies furnished to the parties who own these documents. Is not that the motion?

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will have to speak for itself.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I could not hear it read here.

The Secretary read the resolution of Rev. Dr. Clark, of New Jersey.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I understand that to mean that the originals are to belong to the House. Now, I do not think there is any lawyer in this Assembly who will maintain that the House have aught to do with the title or the possession of these original papers, not that it is of much importance in this case, but that it is a precedent which ought never to be set. The testimony produced in this case is partly in writing and partly oral. How are you going to preserve the original oral testimony which was not recorded, and yet record and preserve a part of the testimony in the possession of the House? Did any one ever yet hear that a Court of Record, after a trial had been had and terminated and decided and there was no appeal, that the Court kept possession of the title-deeds to a man's property, that the Court kept possession of original papers that might be of value, that the Court kept posses-

sion of letters written from party to party? Surely upon reflection this thing will not be insisted upon, and, therefore, I move as a substitute that the documents be given into the possession of the parties, and that the Secretary keep copies of them.

The PRESIDENT. I would remind the House that at the close of the debate, and the voting, the House adopted a resolution to remove the injunction of secrecy from all the previous proceedings. That, it seems to me, did away with this question which is before us. It makes the whole thing public, and anybody who wants documents can go and get them, or copies of them.

Mr. SMITH, of Western New York. When the remarks which have just fallen from the lips of the Chair were about to be made, I was on the point of rising in my place to say precisely what the Chair has said—that these documents, having been placed in the possession of the House, and having become a part of the records of this House, and the injunction of secrecy having been removed by the vote of this House from its proceedings in secret session, any member of this House, as a matter of right, has the privilege of taking a copy of any of the documents without any vote of this House whatever.

When the papers that were presented here on behalf of Dr. Seymour were read, those papers were his own written testimony, delivered to this House for its use, and not read here as the private papers of an individual, and I so regarded them at the time, and so, I think, did every member of this House regard them at the time; and with that feeling strongly impressed upon my mind, I requested Judge Sheffey, who read the letter from the Bishop of Western New York, addressed to myself, to deliver the letter to me, after his speech was made, that it might be placed on file with the Secretary of this House, and it was so immediately placed on file, as it was right and proper that it should be.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. The gentleman will allow me to say that I understand it is not on file.

Mr. SMITH, of Western New York. It is on file, and has never been removed from the files of this House from the time Judge Sheffey took his seat.

The SECRETARY. I have the letter of Bishop Cox.

Mr. SMITH, of Western New York. There is no reason why that letter, or the written answer, and the written testimony sent to this House by Dr. Seymour himself, and read to this House for its instruction, as to his views, and as the evidence that he tendered in his own behalf as to his position, should remain where he placed it—in the possession and the control of this House. Believing that to be beyond dispute, and believing too that the Chair is entirely right in saying that the injunction of secrecy having been removed, any Deputy here has a right to receive copies of these records, as of any other proceedings that have become the records of this House, I regard, as the Chair does, that this motion is entirely unnecessary and useless; and having that view, I move to lay this whole subject upon the table.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I should like to say a single word. ["Order, order."] I understand the ruling of the Chair to be—

The PRESIDENT—The Chair has not ruled anything.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I thought the Chair did. ["Order, order."]

The PRESIDENT. The Chair merely made a suggestion to the House. It is moved that the pending matter be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Allow me to present these papers?

The PRESIDENT. Hand them to the Secretary.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I give all I have to the Secretary—the original papers; I have no copies.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported that leave of absence for the remainder of the session had been granted to Rev. Montgomery Schnyler, D.D., of Missouri; Rev. Warren H. Roberts, of Indiana; Mr. Peter B. Bailey, of Mississippi.

STATE OF THE CHURCH.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York, from the Committee on the State of the Church, presented the following report:

The Committee on the State of the Church have had necessarily to postpone their report till we approach the close of the session for several reasons, but principally on account of the delay in receiving the Tabular Digest of the several Dioceses, and the incompleteness of many of them when they come into our hands. Although the Secretary of the House, as we are informed, furnishes the ecclesiastical authority of each Diocese with the proper blank form some days and some weeks before the General Convention, yet in many instances they are not filled out until the Convention has been in session for several days, and then very often imperfectly, for want of the necessary documents. We have endeavored to guard against these delays and inconvenience in future Conventions by recommending a form of parochial report, and an amendment providing that these important papers shall be presented on or before the first Monday of the session. We very respectfully but earnestly call the attention of Standing Committees to this much-neglected duty."

TEN BISHOPS DECEASED.

During the past three years it has pleased God to remove from the scene of their earthly labors a larger number of our Rt. Rev. Fathers than during any similar period in our history. The following ten Bishops of the Church in these United States, enrolled upon the records of the living at the last General Convention, have since been called to "go up higher," and are now "resting from their labors":

The Rt. Rev. Chas. Pettit McIlvaine, Ohio, March 12, 1873.

The Rt. Rev. Manton Eastburn, Massachusetts, September 11, 1872.

The Rt. Rev. George Upfold, Indiana, August 26, 1872.

The Rt. Rev. Henry John Whitehouse, Illinois.

The Rt. Rev. John Payne (retired), Africa, October 23, 1874.

The Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Davis, South Carolina, December 2, 1871.

The Rt. Rev. Henry W. Lee, Iowa.

The Rt. Rev. George M. Randall, Colorado, September 28, 1873.

The Rt. Rev. William E. Armitage, Wisconsin.

The Rt. Rev. John G. Auer, Cape Palmas, Africa.

Of most of them it may be said "they came to their graves in full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season." Of marked endurance, gifts, peculiarities, and attainments, all have left a record of labor, earnestness, and self-denial that should be kept prominent before the Church for her guidance, encouragement, and support; and well will it be for those who succeed them if they can remedy the imperfections and infirmities of our common nature with as much of infirmity overcome, imperfections removed, and good accomplished, as will be seen in their respective Episcopates. God takes men as they are, and when He finds the willing mind, the true heart, and the self-

consecration, "which counts not life dear unto itself." He works marvellous results, which go on widening and extending long after the human agent has passed away and become forgotten.

SEVEN BISHOPS ADDED.

Seven additions have been made to our line of Bishops during the last three years:

- The Rt. Rev. Mark Anthony De Wolfe Howe, D.D., Central Pennsylvania, 1871.
- The Rt. Rev. William Hobart Hare, D.D., Nebraska, 1873.
- The Rt. Rev. John Gottlieb Auer, D.D., Africa, 1873.
- The Rt. Rev. Benjamin H. Paddock, D.D., Massachusetts, 1873.
- The Rt. Rev. Theodore B. Lyman, D.D., Assistant, South Carolina, 1873.
- The Rt. Rev. John F. Spaulding, D.D., Colorado, 1874.
- The Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles, D.D., Wisconsin, 1874.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCH.

The documents laid before us, coming from all portions of our widely-extended Church, present evidences generally of growth and advancement, and furnish great cause for devout gratitude to the Divine Head of the Church. It is a singular and noteworthy circumstance that, at a period when within the Church there are great diversities of sentiment, and, in the opinion of many, both additions to the faith as well as suppressions or overshadowings of essential principles; while without indifference and unbelief have appeared in almost Protean forms, and with all the power of cultivated intellect and earnest determination have laid the axe at the very foundations of our holy religion, yet there has been not only no fleeing before the enemy, no traitorous surrender of the citadel of Divine truth, no leaning upon the armor in mute wonder at the boldness and magnitude of the attack; but zeal was never more persevering, self-denial never more ready to seize opportunity, and attention never more acute in hearing the word of command. The details are most encouraging, and the work accomplished shows how well the Master has been served and the labors rewarded, for it is a reward when we see that the Divine "Word has free course and is glorified."

But there are in these documents some facts that are not cheering or satisfactory. In 1871 there were 448 candidates for Holy Orders, and in 1874 but 301: decrease in three years, 147. In 1873 it is said there were no ordinations in 17 Dioceses, and of the whole number of candidates only 60 or 70 were able to maintain themselves. Thus we have not only the supply of the ministry diminished, but the fact revealed that parents of pecuniary ability, elevated social position, and great culture, seemingly withhold their sons from the Lord's higher service. We have also had our attention called to the fact that, in many instances, the young novitiate is admitted to the Diaconate and Priesthood with such imperfect qualification that we are forced to the conclusion that there is great imperfection in our legislation, or they whose office and duty call them to decide upon the qualifications of candidates are too lenient in their admission of the applicants. Your Committee, while conscious of much imperfection in our Canons, are inclined to adopt the latter alternative, and would therefore suggest to all chaplains increased vigilance and particularity in conducting the requisite examinations.

MISSIONARY WORK.

We find long records of missionary work and the great success attending it; and every earnest Christian has occasion to rejoice in the contemplation of

our most gratifying expansion and growth. But all such mission labor involves the providing of the Church building of some form at the very outset. The missionary finds the field too destitute to furnish the means for its erection. Being absent from his post to solicit aid involves the loss of many weeks and months; much personal humiliation, to be followed not infrequently by failure; while the places of wealth and enterprise visited find such applications so numerous that it seems to have become a settled conviction in the Church that either the missionary ought to build no faster or better than the ability of his people justifies, or, if there is no such ability, we ought to have a *general building fund*, to be disbursed by wise and judicious managers to those who are in need. We hail, therefore, with great pleasure the measure which has just been inaugurated by the call of the Presiding Bishop for a preliminary meeting in this city, and trust that the whole Church will see how important are earnest effort and large liberality to make it effectual in accomplishing the end proposed. The very existence of a Church Building Society will suggest the opportunity to the affluent, and all the devoted members of the Church, for benefiting the ignorant and the destitute with the knowledge of the Gospel.

Circumstances have also called our attention to two sections of our common country, which seem to be in some degree neglected in our mission work: the Northern New England States, and the destitute regions of the South. If it be said that the population of these old States is diminishing as they go to people the vast West, we reply, Which is best, to draw that element within the Church while at the homestead and growing up on their old native hills, or to wait till they become fired with a worldly ambition to be rich, or to gain place in a new country, and then go forth without religious training and with no spiritual anchorage to found towns, and cities, and States; when the labor of bringing them to a knowledge of the truth will be tenfold greater, and prove entirely ineffectual? Three years ago the wants of the South were pressed very earnestly in the Committee's report, and we see no reason for changing one word of that just representation. When we consider the small number of our Indian tribes, a few hundred thousand, and the more than four millions of the colored race, and that some \$70,000 or \$80,000 were contributed to the former when the Commission had difficulty in sustaining free schools and missions among the latter, we may well ask whether this is "rightly dividing the word of truth," and giving to every man as he has need. But the case is worse than this, for the several Southern Dioceses in their length and breadth are calling to-day for our sympathy, prayers, and aid, and will reward the Church for any abundance that may be granted in their great need. "A people that never spared of their own wealth in days of prosperity should not be forgotten when claiming a blessing in their destitution. We are not to bestow all that we have upon that portion of the field which just now is most rapidly increasing, but, remembering the actual work of the past in the Southern section of our land, draw our favorable inferences for the future—if opportunity is given, aid afforded, and fostering care extended, which are necessary for developing the large resources and capabilities possessed by a once prosperous people.

AN ENCOURAGING FUTURE.

In view of the history of the past triennial period, and the events that are transpiring around us, we can unhesitatingly avow our fixed conviction that this Church has a most encouraging future before her; that labor has never been more earnest, faith more positive, self-sacrifice more devoted, and kindly feeling and charity among brethren more

general. All we seem to need is a higher standard of personal holiness among all our people, and a larger measure of liberality in sustaining the works the Church has in hand to secure in the future a growth and expansion that shall exceed even the great advancement of the past. The field is widening—the enemy is alive and powerful; and it behooves us to fight manfully, contend earnestly, for the faith once delivered to the saints, and “work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.”

The reports of the several Dioceses are herewith presented, and form a part of this report.

The Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

“Resolved, That the view of the state of the Church here presented be transmitted to the House of Bishops, asking their prayers and blessings, and requesting them to prepare and cause to be published a Pastoral Letter to the members of the Church.”

All which is respectfully submitted.

E. M. VAN DEUSEN,
Chairman.

FORM OF PAROCHIAL REPORT

To be recommended for use in this Church.

—— Church, —— Parish, —— City or County,
—— Diocese, —— Rector.

NUMBER OF FAMILIES.

WHOLE NUMBER OF SOULS.

BAPTISMS.—Infants.

Adults.

Total.

CONFIRMATIONS.

COMMUNICANTS.—Added by removal.

Added by admission.

Whole number added.

Removed.

Died.

Withdrawn.

Suspended.

Whole number lost.

Present number.

MARRIAGES.

BURIALS.

PUBLIC SERVICES.—On Sundays.

On other days.

HOLY COMMUNION.

Number of times administered.

Public.

Private.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

Number.

NUMBER OF TEACHERS.

Number of Males.

Number of Females.

Total.

NUMBER OF OTHER OFFICERS.

Number of Scholars.

Number of Males.

Number of Females.

Total.

PARISH SCHOOLS.

Number of Teachers.

Number of other Officers.

Number of Scholars.

Males.

Females.

Total.

OTHER PAROCHIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Contributions within the Diocese.

Parochial.

Alms.

Missions.

Rector's Salary.

Parish Expenses

Miscellaneous.

Total.

DIOCESAN.

Bishop's Salary.

Missions.

Miscellaneous.

Total.

WITHOUT THE DIOCESE.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

Indian.

Foreign.

Miscellaneous.

Total.

Aggregate.

CHURCHES—Number.

Chapels.

Sittings in Churches.

Sittings in Chapels.

RECTORY.

Estimated Value of Church or Chapel.

Estimated Value of Rectory.

Estimated Value of other Church property.

Total.

Am't of Indebtedness of Church property.

*Form of Report to be made by the Bishop of the
Diocese to the Annual Convention.*

CHURCH HOSPITALS.

Name.

Location.

When Organized.

Number of Inmates.

Amount of Endowment.

Annual income.

Contributions.

Total Income.

CHURCH ASYLUMS FOR ORPHANS.

Name.

Location.

Number of Inmates.

Amount of Endowment.

Annual income.

Contributions.

Total Income.

CHURCH HOMES, for training of Deaconesses for the aged and infirm, etc., etc.

Name.

Location.

Object.

Endowment.

Annual income.

ACADEMIES.

Name.

Location.

No. Teachers.

Pupils.

Endowment.

COLLEGIATE.

Name.

Location.

Officers.

Number Students.

Graduates up to date.

Amount of Endowment.

Annual income.

Total income.

THEOLOGICAL.

Name.
Location.
Officers.
Students.
Alumni to date.
Volumes in Library.
Value of Land and Buildings.
Amount of Endowment.
Annual income.

OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Name.
Location.
Officers.
Students.
Endowment.
Annual income.
Total income.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I move the adoption of that report, and that 500 copies of it be printed for the use of the Deputies. It is desired that this document should be spread throughout the Church. It contains valuable facts, and it is thought that a large number of copies will be desired. If the Convention should order 500 copies to be printed, additional copies can be obtained by purchase from the printer. I make the motion.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put a separate question first on the adoption of the resolution reported by the Committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion to print 500 copies.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I hope the number may be so enlarged that each parochial clergyman may have a copy. I would print as many of those reports as copies of the Pastoral Letter are printed. This is one of the most important documents brought before the House during its whole Session. This is the result of the deliberations of a Committee composed of a representative from each Diocese of the Church. It contains most important suggestions, and I can conceive of no way in which we can do a better service to the Church than by printing a sufficient number to place one copy in the hands of each Parochial Clergyman. I hope a large edition will be ordered.

The PRESIDENT. Does the Deputy from Michigan make any motion?

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I would ask the Secretary the number of our parochial clergy?

The SECRETARY. About three thousand.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. I would say three thousand copies.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. As a member of the Committee on Expenses I object. We want to economize all we can.

Rev. Dr. GEER, of New York. I hope the matter will be left open, so that every member can order as many copies as he may desire from the Secretary, or from the person printing. Already one clergyman, a member of this House, has ordered one thousand copies for his own use in his parish, and I doubt not that many will order large numbers. It seems to me that if the original resolution offered by Mr. Livingston is proposed, then the report being in type copies may be ordered as they are needed or desired by the clergyman. I understand that the proprietors of THE CHURCHMAN who are to print this report will receive orders, so that, if the resolution is passed in its original form as presented by Mr. Livingston, it will be satisfactory.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. With that explanation, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn, and the question is on the motion of Mr.

Livingston to print five hundred copies of this report for the use of the House.

Rev. Mr. CADY, of New York. It appears on the Journal, does it not?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. Then I do not see the necessity of printing it.

The motion was not agreed to.

POSTURES IN COMMUNION SERVICE.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, presented the following report, which was read:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution proposing a request to the House of Bishops of the expression of their opinion as to postures in the Communion Service, respectfully report:

"That they have considered the same and are of opinion, in view of the recommendation already made by the Committee of a commission to revise the Rubrics, that it is not expedient to adopt the resolution. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed resolution in regard to postures in the communion service."

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons through mistake. It was a clerical error in the record. On page 49 of THE CHURCHMAN, the stenographic report, it will be seen that the President said, immediately after the offering of the resolution, "The resolution will go on the Calendar." Instead of that, by mistake, it was sent to the Committee on Canons. It is purely an error. I hope, therefore, that it may be permitted to take its place on the Calendar, where it was ordered originally.

The PRESIDENT. It will go there now, of course.

CANON ON DIVORCE.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois, submitted the following report, which was placed on the Calendar:

"The Committee on Canons have had under consideration Message No. 21, of the House of Bishops, containing an amended Canon on the subject of Divorce, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved (that the House of Deputies concur with the House of Bishops in the proposed Canon on the subject of Divorce, with the following amendments):

"1. Strike out Section I.

"2. Strike out Sections III., IV., and V.

"3. Strike out the words 'Section II.'

"So that the Canon may read as follows:

"Of Marriage and Divorce.

"No minister of this Church shall solemnize matrimony in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, and where the divorce was obtained for some cause arising after marriage; but this Canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again."

NEW DIOCESE IN WISCONSIN.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia, submitted the following report, which was read:

"The Committee on the Admission of new Dioceses, to whom was referred the memorial from the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Wisconsin, asking the consent of the General Convention to the creation of a new Diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of Wisconsin, respectfully report:

"That having examined the documents commit-

ted to them, and found them to be correct, they recommend the adoption of the following preamble and resolution :

"Whereas, a request has been presented to the House of Deputies from the Diocese of Wisconsin that a new Diocese must be erected in the present Diocese of Wisconsin, to consist of the nineteen counties of Marathon, Oconto, Shawano, Door, Kewaunee, Brown, Outagamie, Waupaca, Portage, Wood, Adams, Waushara, Winnebago, Calumet, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Fond du Lac, Green Lake, Marquette, and also such portion of Dodge County as may be necessary to include in the limits of the new Diocese the village of Waupun ; and whereas it appears by official documents laid before this House that the Bishop of Wisconsin has consented to the erection of said Diocese, and that all the requirements of the Fifth Article of the Constitution are fulfilled. Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this House (the House of Bishops concurring) do consent to and ratify the formation of the said new Diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of Wisconsin."

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I hope this resolution will be put on its passage now.

The resolution was agreed to.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. I ask the consent of the House to suspend the rules for the purpose of getting permission, if I can, to have put upon the Calendar the resolution referring to the Centennial Celebration, which I had the honor of offering yesterday.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on suspending the rule which requires all new business to be introduced on or before the 16th day of the session, for the purpose of receiving the resolutions indicated.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I ask that these resolutions be read, that the House may be able to vote deliberately upon them.

The PRESIDENT. They have not been presented yet. The question is on suspending the rule to let them be presented.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. May I speak upon the question ?

The PRESIDENT. I am rather inclined to think you can.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I can speak upon the suspension of the rules.

The PRESIDENT. I think so, as at present advised.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. Is it in order to demand that the new business shall be read to the House until consent is given ?

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I think the gentleman from Kentucky perfectly right. We must suspend the rules before we can take up the question at all.

The PRESIDENT. I think so.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. The question is, whether we shall suspend the rules to allow new matter to be received.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I move to lay the motion to suspend the rules on the table.

Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. Cannot I say two or three words ? ["Order," "Order."]

The PRESIDENT. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTION OF VICE-PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT. The business appointed for eleven o'clock is the election of a Vice-President by ballot.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move that the House proceed to the election of a Vice-President under the standing order adopted yesterday.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. In behalf of the Lay Delegation of Pittsburgh, I nominate for the office of Vice-President the Hon. Lucius B. Otis, a Lay Deputy from the Diocese of Illinois.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I nominate the Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of the Diocese of Connecticut.

Rev. Dr. DALZELL, of Louisiana. On behalf of the deputation of Louisiana, I beg to nominate the Hon. Judge Comstock, of the Diocese of Central New York.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I beg to nominate the Hon. Mr. Montgomery, of Western New York.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I nominate Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, of Central New York.

Mr. ANDREWS, of Ohio. On behalf of the Delegation from Ohio, I nominate Judge Sheffey, of Virginia.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. I ask to nominate Hon. Mr. Baldwin, of Michigan.

Mr. LAMBERTON, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I nominate the Hon. George W. Race, of Louisiana.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I ask leave respectfully to decline.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. I respectfully decline the nomination, and would nominate Hon. Judge Otis.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I would put in nomination the name of the Hon. John W. Stevenson, of Kentucky.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. This is a new office instituted two days ago. I want to know what his business is to be, in order that I may vote intelligently on the matter.

The PRESIDENT. You will have to go back to the report of the Committee on Canons, who reported the order creating the office.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I am exceedingly obliged to the Reverend Deputy from Long Island (Rev. Dr. Schenck) who nominated me, but I respectfully ask that my name be withdrawn.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of Connecticut. Mr. President, we are now in the fourth week of this session. We must spend at least half this day in the ballot, and I move to lay the whole matter on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the order for eleven o'clock this day—the election of Vice-President—be laid on the table.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to make an enquiry. If we pass this matter by, is there a Canon which makes it the duty of the next Convention to elect a Vice-President ?

The PRESIDENT. The Canon has been passed, and all that this motion does is to lay the order of the day on the table.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I will repeat my question. I understand a Canon has been passed which makes it the duty of the General Convention, or of this House, to elect a Vice-President. I make the enquiry, in case we pass over this order of business this Convention, would it not be the duty of the next Convention at its organization to elect a Vice-President ?

The PRESIDENT. I understand so ; most certainly.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. So I supposed, and that being the case I suppose we might let it pass over now.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is certainly the case.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is to lay on the table the order of the day for eleven o'clock this day in regard to the election of Vice-President.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. If I understood the chair—

The PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I do not mean to debate it. If I understand the President, there was an order of the day fixed yesterday for the election of a Vice-President to-day at eleven o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. Now I understand that the motion about to be put is to lay that on the table. I say that it is unparliamentary. You cannot lay it on the table; it is already a fixed order. You can move to discharge the order; but the motion to lay on the table an order already fixed is a new mode of parliamentary proceeding, I apprehend. You can postpone the order; you can discharge the order; but to lay on the table that which has already passed is a new mode of proceeding. I trust, if it is desirable to do what is proposed, a change will be made in the motion, so as to postpone the order, either indefinitely or to a fixed time.

The PRESIDENT. I do not know which mode is best; but the order had been taken up, and was in process of execution; and then I supposed that, as well as any other matter before the House, could be laid on the table.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. No, sir, the motion should be to discharge the order indefinitely.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I agree with the President in saying that any matter before the House for consideration can be laid on the table. Otherwise you might have a Canon made the order of the day, which you could not lay on the table. It is always under the control of the House to lay anything on the table.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I move in lieu of the motion to lay on the table, that the order be discharged indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT. I do not know which is the proper motion.

Mr. PARKER, of Virginia. I submit that it must be manifest that if the House is not prepared at this moment when an order comes up to act upon it, it has a right to lay it on the table and keep it under its control; and that is all that we are doing. My own hope is that this matter will not be carried any further, but left the law for future Conventions, that in organizing the House in the early part of the session this office will be filled.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on the motion to lay on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CANON ON RITUAL.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. Will an amendment to the Canon on the subject of Ritual be now in order?

The PRESIDENT. That matter is not before us, but it may be brought before us now by motion.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move that we proceed to the consideration of the order of the day of yesterday, being the Canon on Ritual.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move to amend that it be the order of the day for twelve o'clock, and that we proceed in the meantime with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. It is now the order of the day for twelve o'clock.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move that we go on with the Calendar until twelve o'clock.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I move to take up on the Calendar the report in regard to the Nicene Creed.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It would require a suspension of the rules to take up the Calendar before the time appointed by the rule, and I think it possible, if we go into the discussion of the Canon on Ritual, that we may conclude it before two o'clock, at which time another order of the day will come up.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Mr. BURGWIN to take up at this time for consideration the Canon on Ritual.

The motion was agreed to, and the House resumed the consideration of the Canon on Ritual reported by the Committee on Canons.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it seems to me one thing we must admit in the teaching of to-day: that Ritualism is a mode of teaching adopted everywhere. In my own profession, a gentleman who had studied his profession fifty years ago told me that when he began to study medicine there was put into his hands a book in twenty volumes which he was to read, and when he had finished that there was put into his hand a book in thirty-five volumes of commentary on that book, and that he had to read through. Now when we get a medical student we do not give him a book. The first thing we do, we put him into a physiological laboratory, then into a chemical laboratory, and so on. We make him work. We appreciate what one of my friends from Massachusetts told us here of the great importance of teaching by Ritualism. As I said, we appreciated in Massachusetts, at one time, something of the want of Ritualism. I am in hopes that the gentlemen of this House will have an opportunity of going to Boston, and that we shall show them a little Ritualism there. I should like to take them around Massachusetts, and show them some of the old meeting-houses and some of the old Communion tables there. Our people did not believe in Ritualism. They built little houses for the town meetings in week time, and church meetings on Sunday; and I can show you meeting-houses where the moderators of the public meetings used to sit and score the tallies of the votes on the Communion table with a knife, because the jack-knife was a more familiar instrument with them than the pen, and that was the easiest way of recording votes. I know that my ancestors originally, when they left the church, believed in a Divine Presence in the sacrament of the communion; that they believed in regeneration by baptism; that they believed in a grace being given in baptism; but they threw away fonts and altars and consequently they have lost that great truth. You will find that there are very few baptisms now comparatively in the Congregational body. Every child of the congregation, two hundred years ago, was brought to be baptized. They took away the font, and you find that baptisms are so rare, they do not baptize the children of any except church members now, and in that respect the Baptists have a great advantage over them. And so you find regard to this other sacrament. As administered by them, they invite everybody to it. In the place of worship where I was brought up they had very strong notions two hundred years ago of the Divine Presence in that sacrament, and the grace to be had by it, but now, everybody, men, women and children, are invited to come and partake of the elements, and coming from Massachusetts, I cannot but appreciate the importance of a Ritualistic mode of teaching.

Then with regard to the mode of presenting it. I have heard of a certain Celt who came to this country, and having been here a few weeks, some one said to him, "Pat, you are in a land of liberty; are you not happy? Can you not do what you like?" Said he, "I can do what I like, but I am not happy; I want to make everybody else do and think just as I please." [Laughter.] I understand that is the position of the late Assistant Bishop of Kentucky. He wanted freedom to teach all his doctrines. There was no Canon to hinder him. There was no restraint at all. We gave him the highest post in the Church. We made him Assistant Bishop. We sent him forth to preach all his doctrines; but suddenly he left us. Why? Could he not preach

everything he did? Yes; but because he could not make everybody else think and do just as he thought, he went off.

Now, I hope we are not going to puritanize this Church, and endeavor to put down laws and rules, and endeavor to make these narrow restrictions. I glory in this Church, coming to it from a sect, because it is the Catholic Church, and there is nothing that pleases me more in it, and edifies me more in it, than in being associated with persons who differ from me in particular points.

Gentlemen have spoken of extreme Bishops. Sir, we had an extreme Bishop in Massachusetts, who was my personal friend during the whole time, and I owe the greatest obligations to him personally. I consider that, if there is any circumstance for which I ought devoutly to thank God, it is that I had for my Bishop, for my pastor, and for my personal friend, a man of extreme opinions, and who differed from me very widely in many things; and much more, I say for the pastor of the only Ritualistic church in all New England, that I know that Bishop Eastburn knew of its existence, and that Bishop Eastburn was after all its principal benefactor by the course he pursued. I do not think there was a church in all Massachusetts which parted from its Bishop, when death removed him, with so much regret as did that Ritualistic Church of the Advent.

Now with regard to this mode of putting down and restraining doctrine, I tell you it will not succeed. Come to Boston, as I hope you will, and we will teach you a little Ritualism. You may ask what is the highest point in Boston. What is that spire? I will tell you it is architecturally known as the tooth-pick spire, from resemblance to that instrument; but that is a Baptist meeting-house; and its spire is the highest point in all Boston.—you may ask who are the Baptists, and I tell you those Baptists are the men whom my ancestors flogged with the whip at the cart's tail and drove over to Rhode Island, and in Rhode Island they have multiplied and grown, and now they have come back and occupy the highest point in Boston. I will take you to Cambridge and show you the largest place of worship there. It is a stone Baptist meeting-house in the very school of their persecutors, and you will ask, "What is this large cathedral; what are all these numerous buildings?" Those are Roman Catholic Churches, Roman Catholic convents and schools, and the Roman Catholics are the largest denomination in all Boston, and those are the men whom we would not allow to worship God in Boston, and we made them, in all sorts of weather, if they wanted to perform the rites of their religion, go down twelve miles into the Harbor on an island there; and after all the pains we took, they have come back and are the largest denomination in Boston to-day.

Then, sir, I could tell you a little piece of the history of the modern reign of Puritanism. That is the way you would deal with Ritualists now. There came a Pennsylvania Ritualist into Massachusetts about twenty-five years ago. He was born and bred in Pennsylvania. He was nurtured in Maryland, and that, perhaps, is the reason why the Clerical Deputy from Maryland is so anxious for a Canon on this subject. He came to Massachusetts, bringing with him a kind of fever and ague or malaria from there, and he went to a church there. The sign of the cross was identified with Popery twenty years ago, and he had the great imprudence on Christmas Day to put up in the decorations of the church a cross made of holly; and he never entered that church again. He was turned out ignominiously. The Wardens and the Vestry took his robes and put them on a

wheel-barrow, and got them out the back-door, and he was driven away in poverty in the middle of winter. Then it was that I made his acquaintance. Under such circumstances it was that his wife, the niece of one of the most honored clergymen in this Church, the daughter of a former Mayor of Philadelphia, gave birth to a son who lingered only two or three years and then died. That wife lived some ten or twelve years after, but always a miserable invalid. He then undertook a church ministrations to the seamen and the poor in a certain part of the city. We gave him more discipline than that, we let him start his church, and after he had got it going, and had got a committee of the Convention to act on his application, and all was going on well, we turned him out. We said he did not tell the truth. He was a man who saw things with rather a roseate hue. I never knew him to complain of this, or to lose heart; but he was turned out from that charge. It did not discourage him. He went to work again. His friends supported him, and for fifteen or twenty years he ministered most acceptably among the poor. He commanded the confidence of Unitarians and Congregationalists, who gave him money. He went about and supported himself on the alms of the people; and when he came to die—I was with him at the time—he was so poor that we could not find enough decent clothes in his wardrobe to bury him; and yet when he died he left a property of thirty-five thousand dollars to his church securely in its hands, so that it is now a free church—a church for the poor. The church got the benefit of his labor. My friends from Pennsylvania, and my friends from Maryland, if you have any more such Ritualists, send them to us in Massachusetts, and we can do better with them than they can in Connecticut. We always think ourselves in Massachusetts a little ahead of Connecticut. We will take better care of them, and we can assure you we will make very good use of them.

I have only to say in conclusion that with all this experience of trying to drive away error from the Church, it is my belief that the wheat and the tare should grow up together. They will be separated at the end of the harvest. It seems to me that the opinion of Gamaliel is good in these times, and may be applied to Ritualists: "Refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this work be of man it will surely come to naught."

MR. ANDREWS, of Ohio. Mr. President, I propose to confine myself entirely to the legal aspects of this case, and not to the theological. You will observe, gentlemen, that the discussion is very much narrowed down. In the first place, under this report it is limited entirely (and I wish to call attention particularly to that fact), to the symbolizing of erroneous and doubtful doctrine in the administration of the Lord's Supper. Gentlemen seem to lose sight of that. I want to call attention to that fact at the outset. Now, it is admitted on all hands, I am glad it is, that the symbolizing of erroneous and doubtful doctrine ought to be stopped, and that the Canon to that extent is unobjectionable.

It is admitted, further, by nearly every speaker, that the mode of dealing with it which we have indicated—by the admonition of the Bishop—is the right mode. One gentleman, it is true, has said to us that he prefers an ecclesiastical trial. Gentlemen, do you prefer an ecclesiastical trial? Do my brethren of the bar prefer an ecclesiastical trial? Nine times out of ten in an ecclesiastical trial—you know it and I know it—the remedy is worse than the disease. The best thing about this Canon is that it gets rid of ecclesiastical trials and puts this question in the hands of the Bishops of this Church; and

if we are to have any Bishops in this Church, what can they deal with if they cannot deal with false doctrine?

One gentleman asks, Why do you not let the laity make complaint? Why is it that you limit the right of complaint to Presbyters? For this reason; that if any Bishop hesitates to do his duty, there can probably be found two Presbyters in this Diocese to hold him to it. That is the reason we put that in. But do we wish every layman, every man that has a crochets in his head—and the laity have crochets in their heads, as you know—to be getting up and pushing this question in the face of his Bishop and his minister every day? Not at all. We put safeguards about that thing.

There is one other matter that was referred to, and it was the meaning of the word "doubtful" in the clause as to the Bishops admonishing for the symbolizing of erroneous or doubtful doctrine. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Rev. Dr. De Koven) made a point on that. He said this word "doubtful" should not have been used, that "erroneous and strange doctrines" should be pointed at. As I understood the connection, the word "doubtful" here means substantially what the word "strange" would mean; and I see no appreciable difference between them, and I think my brethren of the bar will agree with me. But what is it that we aim at? If a man wishes to preach doubtful doctrine in this Church, let him preach it like a man, and if I hear it or you hear it, let us answer it like men, and we know what we are about; but this symbolizing of doubtful doctrine, this insinuating of doubtful doctrine to men, women, and children who are not in the habit of discussing these matters, that tends to make a lodgment and that you cannot answer, is what we aim at. If a man wishes to preach doubtful doctrine in this Church, let him do it; but let him do it openly by word of mouth and not by symbols. I say the word is rightly there.

I desire to say, gentlemen, that substantially this far we are agreed in reference to this Canon. These criticisms are minor criticisms. If you agree as to the substance of this thing, you are not going to defeat it on any of the grounds to which I have referred. They are merely incidental; they do not touch the substance of the matter. But now we come to a point that needs discussion. It is as to the specifications to which gentlemen object—incense, the crucifix, etc. Why, says the gentleman from Wisconsin, incense is a delightful thing; there is no harm in incense; incense means prayer; and he quotes the literal language of the Scripture as part of his argument. I might quote the literal language of the Scripture as part of my argument, if I did not deem it unworthy of this occasion to attempt to influence this body by it. I might say that Jehovah Himself said, under certain circumstances, that incense was an abomination to Him; but I would not deem that appropriate to this argument at all.

What is the meaning of incense in connection with the administration of the Lord's Supper? That is the point. Incense is external. We deal with an indwelling presence in this Church. We do not like externalism. Incense is material; we deal with the spiritual. Incense in the Romish Church is used in the celebration of the Mass. Why? Does it mean nothing? Is the Romish Church in the habit of dealing with things that are meaningless in its service? What says the voice of history? What is incense in history? What was it among the Greeks and Romans? It was the localizing of the Divine Presence, before which this act of adoration was done. So it is among heathen nations, in China to-day. How was it among the Jews to whom my friend referred? Incense

was offered in the Temple. Why? Because the Shekinah was in the Temple. That is the reason. It was the localizing of the Divine Presence there. This is the point. Now, if in the administration of the Holy Communion incense is used as a part of your service, does it not symbolize doubtful doctrine in the Protestant Episcopal Church? That is the point.

Next as to the crucifix. The gentleman has referred to the language of our Saviour: "It is expedient that I should go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come; but if I go away I will send the Comforter to you." "I must go away." Why? Because that Spirit cannot come while this external presence is here calling off the worshipper to the external, even though it be the God manifest in Christ I must go away. It is expedient that I go away in order that the Spirit may do my work better. Man communing with God; man walking with God; man becoming like God—that is the mission of the Spirit to which all the other was preliminary; and it was for our benefit that He withdrew His glorious presence in order that this spiritual presence might do its work in the heart of man. Am I not right in this? But what say these gentlemen? It was expedient that this glorious presence should withdraw, but it is expedient that we should put within the chancels of our churches, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, a caricature of His presence! Tell this Church that that is needed for the adoration of its children! Gentlemen, that will not do.

Now, what is the feeling of this Church throughout all the length and breadth of this land in reference to these matters. Suppose that this Convention, expressly or impliedly, were to give voice to the opinion that incense in the administration of the Holy Communion is admissible, and on Christmas next, throughout all the length and breadth of this land, when we come forward to the celebration of the Lord's Supper and present our bodies a living sacrifice holy and acceptable unto God, surprised boys enter these chancels and wave the censer, what do you suppose the effect in this Church would be? I ask you, gentlemen. I do not know what it would be here in New York; I cannot tell; but throughout this whole continent west of this city, if that one thing was authorized and it was understood that this Church had committed itself deliberately to it, I know well that it would break up this Church, and this Convention would never sit again. You would not have to discuss the question whether there could be a Church without a Bishop; but you would have to discuss the question whether there should be Bishops without a Church. There is no mistake about this. It may seem strange to many living under different influences; but there is no mistake about it. I appeal to my brethren without any distinction of Church, High or Low, and I say here that I have just as much faith in my High Church brethren on a question affecting the life of this Church as I have in my Low Church brethren.

Well, how is it with authority on this subject? We have the authority of the Committee on Canons of the Lower House unanimously, and in the House of Bishops we have the authority of the Committee on Canons. We have other authority, some of which has been read. I think, therefore, on the point of authority we stand pretty firm; but there is one legal aspect of this case which I think relieves it of all possible difficulty, and to that I wish to call the attention of my brethren, particularly of the bar.

If I understand this matter, suppose that it were found, as is claimed by the gentleman from Wisconsin,

sin, that we have made a specification here that is erroneous and ought not to be here, that incense is admissible in this Church in the administration of the Holy Communion, and that the crucifix is admissible in this Church in the administration of the Holy Communion, then I ask, gentlemen, what harm have we done? The Bishop to whom this matter comes says: "You have made a mistake, gentlemen; I cannot interfere with this matter on account of this incense," and he so decides. If he decides incorrectly under this Canon, he can be tried for not carrying out the provisions of this Canon. Then what? It comes to the House of Bishops, and they are called upon judicially to determine the constitutionality and legality of this enactment. What harm is done? Every lawyer knows that this happens all the time where a penal enactment is decided finally to be unconstitutional, and therefore is null. It does no harm; no man is injured. You simply give an opportunity for the judicial tribunals to try the question, and if they decide it against you, by and by down from the House of Bishops comes a message to us that they have had before them the subject of incense and the subject of the crucifix, and that they find that their use does not symbolize doubtful doctrines in the administration of the Lord's Supper at all, and the American Church therefore recognize them as part of her instrumentalities. If they tell us that, let us know it. Then we will discuss the proposition whether in some way we cannot express our sentiments in regard to the matter.

So much in regard to these points that have been referred to. Now, gentlemen, it is very strange to me that our friends do not know that this Church is a Reformed Church, a Church of the English Reformation, and that the name "Protestant" is a tolerably important matter to us. It is strange to me that they do not appreciate this fact. Even the Reformers are attacked in this Church. They are vilified and ridiculed martyrs, men who died for the principle for which we are contending to-day are ridiculed in this Church by men who call themselves Protestant Episcopalians; and I think, by these gentlemen, a man is considered a demagogue who stands up in a community and says one word in favor of Cranmer, Cromwell, and Ridley, who went to the stake for this Church.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. What Cromwell? Not Oliver?

Mr. ANDREWS, of Ohio. I mean the Cromwell who preceded Latimer, not Oliver Cromwell.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Lord Cromwell, the Chancellor of Henry VIII.?

Mr. ANDREWS, of Ohio. No, the one who preceded Latimer. I am not speaking of Oliver Cromwell at all. The gentleman from Illinois told me that in Oxford he visited the spot where Cranmer died, and he said that he wept when he stood over the marble slab that covered the place where he suffered. He thought of the time when the name of "Protestant" was given to the English Church, and thought of the baptism in which that name was given, a baptism that deluged a whole generation of Churchmen in blood. He stood in the presence of history, and when the story was brought before his mind he said the tears stood in his eyes. Gentlemen, that had a meaning; it was not without a meaning. It looked to the future. When the martyr stepped into his chariot of fire, he left his mantle behind him. Free government, free conscience, freedom of thought—these are the treasures we have to-day. This Convention meets under the shadow and the protection of these principles, for which these men died. Thousands upon thousands stand up to-day and say that they

will be true to these principles, and, if need be, die for them.

I am amazed at the course gentlemen take, considering the condition of things in this country. What is the condition of things here? Your professional classes, a majority of them—your lawyers, your physicians, your successful business classes—have the clergy much influence over them? I put it to you—have you much influence over them as a class? Are not the vast majority of them out of your reach? Your educated young men that come out of your colleges, have you much influence over them? Are they not drifting to indifferentism? The populations of your cities, how many of them attend upon your services? On an average not one-fifth are within the range of the clergy probably. These are serious matters. Sidney Smith said that the clergy of the Church of England had not more influence over the people of England than the cheese-mongers of England. That was an exaggerated statement there, and it would be here; but the influence of the clergy has been reduced in this country very much. It is certainly at a very low point, and it is doubtful whether it is increasing, and yet I am inclined to think it is. The classes to which I have referred seem to be taking scientific truth rather than theological truth for their guide.

When things are in this condition, when this country is in such a state as this, and these gentlemen stand in the presence of this civilization of ours and undertake to deal with this people, what do they say? Why, they stand up in the presence of all these difficulties, and they say, "What you need for the Church is a little picture-teaching, just as we give to our children." They put their hand on the pulse of this continent, and they feel it beating, beating, beating with incessancy with its current of wonderful life, and they say the only thing necessary is to give the people a few more types and symbols and all will be well! That does not amaze me. Have these gentlemen read history? Did not the Jews have types and symbols? Did they not have Divine types and symbols? Every day when the lamb was sacrificed for a thousand years did it not typify the Great Sacrifice? Was it not intended to teach them that when the Lamb of God came they should know him? And yet when He came they knew Him not and crucified Him. What was the effect on the character of the people of types and symbols? We know very well what it was. They were Scribes and Pharisees—hypocrites.

Gentlemen, I have but a few more words to say. It has been supposed that this Church had no convictions on this subject. That is a great mistake. It has been supposed that this Church had no convictions because this Church is not swift to mark what is done, because sentence upon an evil work is not executed speedily, because this Church is patient, long-suffering, gentle. On one side of the line we have men leaving us, and people say, "You are drifting into Popery; you are indifferent to it." On the other end of the line men say, "We introduce what services and practices we please into the administration of the Lord's Supper, and the General Convention does not rebuke us, and the Bishops are silent." Therefore men infer that we have no convictions on this subject. Now, gentlemen, I appeal to you, have we not made up our minds on this subject; have we not as a Church made up our minds that the evil at which this Canon aims shall cease? I think we have. I do not mean that this Canon in your judgment is entirely perfect. Every man must judge for himself whether this method is the best; but the fact I do say I believe is undoubted that you have made up

your minds at all hazards that the evil aimed at in this Canon shall cease. Now, whether the Canon is wise or not, you have the authority, as I have said, of the Committee on Canons; you must judge for yourselves; but I do trust that you will come to the conclusion that the Canon is proper, and that this Church will this day put its seal of condemnation upon an evil that is at war with its whole history.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. I offer this resolution as a substitute for all that is before the House:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following additional section be added to Canon 20, Title I., 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer.'

"Section 2. [1.] If any Bishop have reason to believe that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion, or any other time during the celebration of Divine Service, not ordained or authorized by the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or strange doctrines, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction, to wit:

"a. The use of incense.

"b. The placing or carrying or retaining a crucifix in any particular place of worship.

"c. The elevation of the elements in the Holy Communion in such a manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made.

"d. Bowings, prostrations, genuflections and all such like acts, not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

"e. The use of private confession otherwise than is allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

"f. Prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary.

"g. Prayers for the dead.

"h. The use of vestments other than the cassock, surplice, and stole and bands, and the black gown, with the Oxford cap.

"It shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his council of advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2.] If, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have been in fact set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instrument of writing under his hand, to admonish the minister of the parish to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3.] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon, the minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be notified, and have opportunity to be heard in his defence. The charges preferred and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceedings in the case."

The PRESIDENT. Does the gentleman offer that as an amendment?

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. As a substitute for the Canon and the amendments already proposed to it.

It seems to me that the difficulty here is that this Committee had something that they felt very venomous in their hand, and they concluded that the best way to deal with it was to take hold of it by one of its extremities. I think it would have been far better if they had grasped it at once by the main

body, and then it would have been less likely to sting in return.

You will observe that the reverend gentleman from Wisconsin, in his amendment, proposed to leave out the two Presbyters. In that, I think, he is right. Then he suggested to leave out "doubtful doctrines," and instead to put in "strange doctrines." I have done that in my amendment. Then, in addition to what the Committee have reported, I introduce "the use of the private confession, otherwise than as allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer; prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary; prayers for the dead; the use of vestments other than the cassock, surplice, stole and band, and the black gown and Oxford cap."

The reverend gentleman who addressed us yesterday, and whom this proposition of course does not touch, though he is thought to be a representative man in this case, seems to think that legislation on this subject is a very cruel thing, that we are going to offer up a sacrifice here, and that he is to be the lamb. Now I think we love him too much for that. I do not believe there is a man in this House, who heard his noble remarks yesterday afternoon, whose heart was not touched, and who did not feel that he would not do him injustice for all the world. No, sir, we do not propose to take away from any gentleman anything that we are not going to take away from ourselves. We are going to put him on precisely the same plane that we are ourselves. We are going to say to him, "You shall do exactly what we do." More than that, we are not going to take away from him Ritual. We are going to leave him that almost untouched. He can have as fine a church as he chooses. He can have as fine music as he chooses. He can have a surpliced choir if he chooses. He can have anything and everything that is legitimate to a Protestant Church; and we do not intend to take it from him. What we propose to do is to take care of him. He is too good a man not to be looked after. [Laughter.] Ah, sir, the difficulty is that he has got astray; we see it, and we know it, and we deplore his errors, though they may be on the side of reverence and devotion. Seeing all this, we want to take temptation out of his way. That is it. We do not propose to take anything from these Ritualists that they ought to have. We will allow that gentleman in Boston, the Rev. Mr. Grafton, the rector of the gentleman who addressed us yesterday and to-day, to preach even that hell-fire that the gentleman talked of, if he consider it necessary to the preaching of the Gospel, which is peace and good-will to men, glad tidings of great joy to all people. We are not going to take away from these gentlemen the opportunity they talk about of working for the poor, for which they are deservedly held in honor. We are going to give them every opportunity to bring the poor into their churches, to give them a handsome Ritual if they choose; but if that gentleman has been preaching so much hell-fire, I do not wonder that he needed a great deal of Ritual to counteract that. I would say, have a little less of that and then you will need a little less of Ritual. [Laughter.]

It seems to me, sir, that we ought to deal with the matter in a common-sense way. Here we are, men representing the Church all over this land, and every man here feels, somehow or other, that this is the most important matter resting on his conscience and entrusted to his care.

Now, I propose simply to take away just two or three obstructions out of the way, that I think it very important before this discussion proceeds further should be done. And first as to this matter of Ritualism. We are all Ritualists in one sense. There is not a man in this House, I am sure, that is

not a Ritualist, who does not love to see God's house what it ought to be, who does not love to hear music as good as we have here, if it can be had. Who does not love to have everything that adds to the sacredness of worship and helps him to lift his heart to God therein? It is not Ritualism—that is a very unfortunate name—it is Romanism that we are trying to get rid of; and we may as well understand it and call things by their right names. It is not Ritualism; it is Romanism.

Another thing in the same direction I desire to get out of the way. I think it is very wrong that these gentlemen should be called "Advanced Churchmen." I never in my life supposed that a man who was going back, retrograding, was a man who was leading in the advance. No, sir; if there be an advanced party in the Church to-day, I contend that it is the Broad Church party, who, when they shall get to be as broad as they are deep, will lead the Church on a path where Catholicity will be practical and Christian unity will be possible.

But now, sir, let us come to a simple common-sense view of the case. I take it that I state what is plainly evident when I say that Protestantism and Romanism are two absolutely different things; that when at the Reformation the Protestants separated from the Romanists, they did like the Egyptians passing out of Egypt, passing through the Red Sea, and, being baptized in blood, came out with that name of Protestants. There is, therefore, a wall built up between the two—a wall that is growing broader, and stronger, and deeper, and higher every day, for, depend upon it, the division between Protestantism and Romanism is getting stronger every day in spite of all the things we hear. That wall is far higher to-day than it was in the days of the Reformation. That wall stands between Protestantism and Romanism an impassable barrier, erected there by the common sense of mankind. Romanism feels that it is there and knows it. Protestantism feels that it is there and knows it. But now, what do we find? We find these men endeavoring to pull that wall down. We find them to-day on this side, and to-morrow on that; now a Protestant, now performing Roman Catholic rites. It puts me in mind of a story of a young collegian at Cambridge, in England, I think it was one who was well posted up in Greek and Latin, but who had not paid much attention to natural science; and upon his examination he was asked whether the sun moved around the earth, or whether the earth moved around the sun; and being somewhat embarrassed, he replied that it was sometimes one and sometimes the other. [Laughter.] That is the condition of these gentlemen.

At the Reformation, what was it? Did the Reformers object only to the abuses of Romanism?—for that is what these gentlemen seem to think. No, sir; it was to the uses; it was to the root of the tree that bore these fruits; and there is where I think this Committee so lamentably fail: they do not go to the root of the matter, but are willing to take one of the extremities. Was it simply the selling of indulgences, for instance, that the Reformers objected to? No, sir, it was the underlying Confessional and the underlying thing at the root of that, which was priestcraft in the Church of Rome. Happily the Reformation divided upon that point. Rome held her priestcraft; Protestantism took her ministers. In no sense can one of her ministers be called a priest in the sense of the Church of Rome; and you know very well that our office of Presbyter does not mean any such thing. No, sir; we have the Presbyter; the Church of Rome has the sacrificing priest. The Presbyter simply points the sinner to the Saviour; clears every obstruction from his path, but in no way undertakes to stand

between the Saviour, and obstruct the way of the sinner to him. The reformers objected not only to the abuses, but to the root of the thing. So here go down to the root, and what do you find? You find that this matter of priest-craft is the very root of the whole evil. These gentlemen do not seem to be very logical. That good brother who spoke yesterday afternoon seemed to be in a profound mist, from which I think it should be the good office of us, his Christian brethren, to bring him out into the daylight, to bring him out from that tabernacle which he talked about, up into the Church of the living God; to bring him out of the darkness of the old dispensation into the sunshine of God's free grace. Therefore, I contend that the Episcopal Church has no priest in the sense of a sacrificing priest, and that is what the word defines it to be. We have no priests in that sense; neither have we any altar in the sense of an altar whereon a sacrifice is made. How can you make an altar of a table? And yet it is the table that is to be covered with a fair linen cloth. The sacrifice, as the good brother was ingenious enough to say here yesterday afternoon, was one of praise and thanksgiving. Yes, that is it; and that is all it is.

Now, sir, if the Committee had taken hold of this thing in the sense in which the conscience of this Church understands it—for I tell you they are all alive to it—there would have been no difficulty; we should gladly have taken their Canon. But it does not deal with it; it blinks the matter, and when it shall go out to the world, there will be a general feeling of dissatisfaction. The people will ask, "Is that all you can do, in view of the dreadful condition in which the Church has been thought to be liable to lapse?" Let me read from a book that is put into the hands of young people now to prepare for the Lord's Supper; printed in this very city in this very year. I read from the "Rules for the Guidance of Communicants:"

"At the Prayer of Consecration commences the most solemn part of the Office. Up to this point Christ is not objectively present, but at the words, 'This is my body'—'This is my blood,' Christ is really present upon the altar, under the form of Bread and Wine. Then the Faithful should bow in reverent adoration before their Lord.

"Remember"—it goes on—"we are then in the immediate Presence of our Lord, as truly present as He is in heaven, only that *there* He will be seen without the Sacramental Veil."

Then it goes on to state the order in which those present shall commune, and one thing most astonishing in that the men, it is said, shall communicate separately from the women. Then it proceeds:

"In going up to Communion *genuflect* as you reach the Chancel. If then the rail is full, *kneel* on the floor till there is a vacant place. . . . On taking your place at the rail *kneel* on the appointed step or cushion, and upright.

"Receive the Lord's Body upon the palm of your right hand crossed over your left so as to make a kind of throne for it, and so reverently raise it to your mouth. Be careful to examine your hand lest any fragment remain therein, in which case you must take it up with your tongue, since every particle contains equally the whole body of your Lord, and, as St. Cyril says, 'How carefully oughtest thou to observe that not a crumb falls from thee of that which is more precious than gold and precious stones!'"

That is enough. In view of that, I think that this proposed Canon of the Committee goes only half way. Why should we not deal with this thing as honest men—as men of common sense, who know what is the fact out of doors, who know the scandal that has come upon the

Church, who know that the Protestant community are in doubt whether we are thoroughly Protestant or not? I say, sir, it is time for the General Convention to speak, and to speak plainly, so that they cannot be misunderstood, and I, for one, should be ashamed to go back from this General Convention carrying in my hand only such a Canon as that reported by our Committee.

But I do not intend to express at all the idea that I fear that the Protestant Episcopal Church is to be Romanized. I do not believe a word of it. You never can persuade me that such a word of intelligent people as compose the Episcopal Church in the United States of America are ever going to be Romanized? No, sir; but they will be greatly scandalized; the Church will be retarded in her progress; she will lose the prestige with which she started upon her way; and it only needs for this Church to place herself unmistakably, emphatically upon plain Protestant ground, that every man in this community can understand, for her to march forth as an army with banners, and when she shall have got the true idea of her mission that she is one who is to simply declare the truth as it is in Jesus, leaving the widest possible range of opinion, requiring nothing of any man to believe but the Creed—when she shall have done that within the bounds of Protestantism, then she will have opened wide her doors, and multitudes from other communions will press in, and not before; and that day is coming.

I do not think it practically any objection to the Protestant Episcopal Church that all this difficulty arises in it. Why does it arise here and not in other denominations? I fancy, in the first place, it is because this Church is composed of such very intelligent men, so thoughtful, so enquiring, and that this Church is wide enough for a man to entertain any honest opinion and to urge it, and that it is a place of such liberty that no man who is a Protestant and holds to Protestant doctrine but has a place here—

THE PRESIDENT. The time of the Deputy from Pennsylvania has expired.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, it was not my purpose when the Canon reported by the Committee came before the House to ask your attention to any observation, because I did not intend to make any; but as the discussion has proceeded, it has seemed to me very plain that this is entirely an open question, and not a party question at all; that the shape it assumes before the House to-day is simply this: Is it policy on the part of this Church to have any legislation at all on this question? If it is policy on the part of this Church to legislate on Ritual, is the Canon reported by the Committee on Canons, or the amendment offered by the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin, or the substitute on amendment just offered by the clerical gentleman from Pennsylvania, the proper legislation to have? I am not going to enter minutely into a discussion of the Canon, for I am free to say that it seems to me to embody an anxious, brotherly, kindly feeling, as it respects differences in the minds of the members of this House on the question of legislating against Ritualism. I give the Committee on Canons the credit of having prayed and thought earnestly over the question, and of having brought in a result that, whether we object to or approve it, whether we vote it up or vote it down, is assuredly a monument of the good-will and brotherly feeling existing in the Committee on Canons. And I am happy and rejoice in the conviction and belief that that same feeling pervades this House, that a most delightful spirit of brotherly kindness has exhibited itself from the beginning of this session down to the present time, and especially was it manifested in that most exciting discussion which

absorbed the attention of the House during eight days.

So that, free from embarrassment, I come to the consideration of the Canon before us, and will give some reasons why, on the whole, not founded in this or that objection, in my deliberate judgment it will not be wise for this General Convention to legislate on Ritual at all; but if anything is done by this House, I believe it should be a carefully, wisely, prudently drawn joint resolution, that declares what is true; that declares what may not fairly be questioned; that negatively, but absolutely and clearly, this Church in her office for the celebration of the Holy Communion has excluded the idea of Eucharistic adoration. By laying down whatever the priest has a right to do in that office, negatively, as I say, yet clearly, has she excluded all right to symbolize what she has not incorporated in the office itself; and I hold that, without a line of legislation on the subject, a Bishop of this Church, without his Standing Committee or with it, can call to account any Presbyter who, in the celebration of the holy offices, interjects or interpolates or symbolizes by any act a view of the sacrament which she does not hold. In the exercise of her power of ordination, she has ordained and commissioned him and placed him there as her agent and servant under the great Head of the Church, and she has the right to limit and restrain him in the exercise of the office. I quite agree with a brother who has gone before me as it respects the difference between symbolizing a doctrine and preaching it. There is a distinction, and the distinction is fairly taken.

The first objection to the form of legislation proposed here is its doubtful constitutionality. I will not discuss it; I merely say that there is a shadow of doubt, to say the very least, hanging over the right of this House to touch the question of ceremonial on the Administration of the Sacrament, except by Rubric, and that requires action on the part of this House, and concurrent action on the part of the Dioceses, and final action of the Convention that shall assemble in 1877.

The next point is this: I can understand how, in the interest of practical work, we might be justified in overloading a Canon or straining the Constitution; but I cannot understand how we are justified, where there is the shadow of a doubt hanging over our right to act owing to constitutional difficulties, in pressing this right to act in the interest of restrictive or repressive legislation.

The next question I raise is, Is legislation necessary? And I wish to be absolutely fair. I would not press this point with an ounce weight of pressure did I not believe it to be the simple truth, and if true, something that ought to guide us in our deliberations and conclusions. Does the present condition of the Church in New York, in Connecticut, in all the Dioceses of the original jurisdiction of New York, generally over the land demand a remedy that can be provided only by Canon? If remedy is needed (and I can understand that there may be occasion for a remedy), I will not undertake to say that in the city where we are assembled a remedy should not be applied in some instances—of that I cannot judge; let the authorities judge—but if a remedy is demanded, does not the remedy already exist in the Rubrics and directions of the Prayer-Book itself? Does this Canon do anything more? I wish to speak with all respect of every member of the Upper House, and yet permit me to ask the question, Does the Canon do more than what I have heard in personal conversation it was intended to do—put back-bone into the Bishops, that they may exercise the powers already held by them—committed to them to be exercised in the

Church? Is that the business of this house? Is that the legitimate object of legislation? If a remedy exist, let the remedy be applied.

The next point I take is, that if the remedy which already exists is not applied, it grows out of a condition of things that will not be changed by this legislation. Now, suppose there is a want of nerve—or I will go further, and suppose that, from considerations of policy, the Bishops are not inclined to enquire too curiously into every eccentricity exhibited by a clergyman in the celebration of Holy Communion—will the enactment of this Canon make any difference whatever? I trow not. It will not remedy it at all. And there is this difficulty that I wish to direct your attention to, for it is founded on principles that underlie all legislation: that there can be no greater evil under the sun, as it respects generating or destroying respect for law, than multiplying legislation that proves ineffectual and that is not likely to be applied. It familiarizes the mind of the people with the notion that the whole thing is a dead-letter, and that self-will instead of written law, or the will of committees instead of written law, is to be the governing principle in our action.

So, then, unless the legislation is called for, unless the legislation proposed is likely to accomplish the result, unless the legislation proposed is likely to be applied practically, it seems to me of doubtful expediency to pass the legislation.

We have all been struck with one thing in the course of this discussion: that the Canon proposed does not give as much as the anti-Ritualists want, and it gives more than the Ritualists desire; and that is a good sign in its favor. As I said, the original report of the Committee on Canons, if we are to have any legislation on Ritual, would be the report which would get my most hearty suffrages and vote.

Now, I wish to speak (and it seems to me to be germane to the general question) of another aspect, and it is this: Considering the proportions of duty, on the part of this great House, representing, as it does, the Church which, under God, has the care of nearly fifty millions of people, that has in trust the Gospel of the Son of God, appointed for the salvation of a people who represent as many languages and tongues as were represented on the day of Pentecost; the Church which has in charge the Gospel of the Son of God, not to send it with its missionaries to the remotest lands and tribes, but who, strangely, in the providence of God, has more fragments of tribes and nations and peoples cut up from the beds where they have rested, and precipitated on to this Church, given into our hands to teach and to train and to save them—considering all this, I ask whether it is wise in this Church in her General Council to give so much time to so little and inconsiderable a question as whether there may be incense burned in a church or a crucifix placed anywhere in it? And here I accompanied with great interest the Lay Deputy from Ohio (Mr. Andrews) who spoke so ably, as he always does on every question, up to this very point, and there we parted ways. I agreed with him that the people of this land looked to the Church and expected great things of her. I agreed with him in the impression that had been made upon his mind as it respects the infidelity whose tidal wave to-day makes the heart of Christian men and Christian ministers quake, whose ground-swell tosses the ark of God hither and thither all over this and other lands. I agreed with him when he said that these men, with an ability which almost implied that they had plucked the tree of knowledge, demanded something at the hands of the Church. And what does the Church propose to give them in reply by

the action of her great Council? There shall be no incense burned in any of our churches! There shall no crucifix be set up in any of our churches! Is this the answer to be given? Darkness universal has settled like a morning fog over the map of Christendom, blotting out not only the tallest mountains, but hiding the valleys of the faith; and we answer with a little Canon about an unimportant practical thing! We are bewildered by the plausible generalizations of Buckle, Prof. Tyndall, with a verbal felicity that lingers on like music to bewilder and allure the hearts of the unstable, with his evolution of force; and Strauss, with his "Universum," have gone far to deny or confuse the popular idea of God; and Darwin, in his "Origin of the Species," has led many Christians to doubt whether the human race is an oyster-bed or a monkey-show. And we answer the argument with an attempt at legislating about a little matter of ceremonial! I say that the true answer cannot be given without toleration and liberty. I do not mean toleration as a concession at all; I mean it as the great duty of the Church, as the right of every minister in it. I say the great answer is hearty, earnest, self-sacrificing work. When John in prison heard of the works that Christ had done, he sent his disciples and asked the question—and it is a significant one—"Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" What was the answer? "Go tell John those things that you do see and hear. The deaf hear; the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. And blessed is he who soever shall not be offended in me."

Now, gentlemen, as I said, this is a question of liberty as far as liberty is compatible with the integrity of the Church; and I beg you carefully to discriminate between the great Creeds and the construction of the Creeds by an individual; the great Creeds and the view of them held by Virginia or Albany, by Maine or Texas, by California or New York—that it is essential to the vitality, to the energy, to the success of the Church that the great Creeds should be the only touchstones of orthodoxy and discipline. Accepting these, let the Church work with ceremonial or without, as she best can. With these, let the Church work with vestments or without, as she can.

It seems to me that the great want of the Church in this land, to-day, is, in some sort, a careful reinvestigation of her modes of work. She ought to hold out encouragement to all forms of true enthusiasm and love for Christ. If it is a Ritualistic mode, go in God's name and work for the sake of souls and for the sake of Christ. If it is the lowest churchman that ever breathed for his soul's health and comfort the vital air of our Communion, let him go in God's name, and work for the honor of the Saviour and the Lord, and for the salvation of souls.

As I said, I am not at all strenuous as to the question beyond this, that clear in my profoundest convictions, I am satisfied that no such state of things exists in the Church, at least I have waited in vain for any evidence to be brought before this House that there is any such state of things existing as calls for this legislation. There are fewer strictly pronounced Ritualistic churches in the United States now than there were in 1871. Whatever is evil, whatever is objectionable, whatever is obnoxious about this thing called Ritual, is, on the whole, on the wane; perhaps through the good judgment and good feeling of the Ritualists themselves; perhaps through the pressure of public opinion; but this great Church of ours clearly, beyond any question whatever, is not to-day, and has never been, in sympathy—it cannot be for at least generations to come, we know not what will be brought about by time—in sympathy with what is known as extreme Ritualism.

But there are people who like it; and because my brother who preceded me does not choose to use the seasoning of salt in his food, he says that we are as fair with you as we are with ourselves; we take from ourselves what we take from you. Speaking to the Ritualist, as he does not like salt, he takes away salt from his brother who does use it and thinks he relishes his food and digests it better for the seasoning.

There is just one point more that I desire to make before I sit down. Is it not worth while to stop and think a little as it respects the kind of legislation that is proposed? We have a Joint Committee on Intercommunion with the Greek Church. Is it a wise thing to do this without any practical reason, because I know of but one or two churches in America (and I have enquired carefully) where incense was ever burned; and I am told that in those perhaps not more than once a year. I say nothing upon it; I do not care a straw about it, or any Ritual that is touched in this Canon or was ever proposed to be touched in any General Convention. It would not come within a thousand miles of reaching anything that I ever did or ever desired to do in the celebration of the Holy Communion; but I state the fact, and it is entitled to consideration, that the Greek Church, with whom we are trying to feel the way to an intercommunion through a joint committee, does burn incense. Is it wise in us without a reason—if there was any real reason for it, a real good to be accomplished by it, it would be worth while, and I would go for it—but without any real pressing reason is it worth while for this Church, not in a Diocesan Convention, not in a vestry meeting, not in some neighborhood office, but in her Great Council, as though it involved a great essential or leading principle, to say that that symbolizes false doctrine? So of the Lutheran Church. And the same is true of the use of the crucifix. I think it a very harmless thing. I never saw one in a church, and I do not suppose I ever shall. My tastes and feelings do not run that way. I am very sorry to say that my besetting sin is not over-devotion, as that it seems some men upon the floor of this House is; and so I care nothing for these things myself, but I can understand that there are others who might care for them. But on the supposition that nobody ever did or ever would care for them, it seems to me a mistaken attitude for this Church to present, to place her finger upon incense burning and the crucifix, as something that she stamps with condemnation under all the solemn responsibilities of Convention in General Council, through the learning, and zeal, and piety of her Bishops, and clergy, and laity; that she deliberately descends from the high work that should occupy her heart, engaged in trying to give the Gospel to the whole land—to the question of incense and the crucifix, and goes out to the constituents represented in this General Convention, carrying these as trophies of a three weeks' convale—as the hatching of a three weeks' incubation. We have answered everything, and the course of the Church is clear; now, having condemned these things that do not exist in her midst at all, having condemned these things that nobody cares anything about, she is henceforth to be fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.

Rev. Dr. GARRETT, of Nebraska. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I am profoundly thankful that we have amongst us here as representatives of this Church so large a body of the laity who are so well qualified to hold us erratic clergymen to the point in argument and to the proper business in duty. I feel that the privilege of listening to their logical disquisitions is itself worthy of a journey of over a thousand

miles. I feel that the Church itself is entitled to high honor because she has recognized the principle of the first Apostolic Council of having not only the Apostles and the Elders, but the brethren, to aid in her great work of legislation for future ages. And I feel, in addition, that it is important because the laity are so large a body in the country to which we are specially sent, a body to whom we are commissioned to minister, and whose sympathy and whose prayer, whose zeal and whose contribution, are absolutely imperatively necessary to the advancement and growth of the work we have in hand.

Now, sir, I submit that there is a necessity for legislation on this question. I submit it first because the joint resolution of this House and the other, as placed upon the records of the last Convention as a method for the amendment of our trouble, which has been referred to by the speaker who has just preceded me, has notoriously failed to give the peace and to give the agreement which we all desire. Therefore, I say that any such measure as that of a mere joint resolution, which recognizes the authority of the Episcopate, but does not give them power to enforce it, is not sufficient in order to the accomplishment of our purpose.

Again, I hold that some legislation is necessary on this question, because of the anxiety which prevails throughout the length and breadth of the land; an anxiety which is borne witness to by the numerous petitions, by the tone and character of the memorials, by the report of your Committee on Canons, and by the patience with which this House has listened to the debates upon this question. It is impossible, therefore, to ignore the existence of that anxiety; and I feel, consequently, that it is our imperative duty to meet the demands of that anxiety, and to satisfy its rightful and legitimate claims upon us, and that, when we are so legislating as to satisfy that anxiety, we are not dealing with trivialities, but we are dealing with the very principles that lie at the foundation of our hopes for the growth and advancement of this great Church in this new land.

And, sir, I feel further that we are called upon to legislate upon this question, because, confessedly, I am afraid it must be admitted these Ritualists (whether intentionally or unintentionally I do not for a moment pretend to say) are to some extent, if not to a large extent, hinderers of the Church's work; and when I make that statement I make a strong statement, and one which I suppose will be contradicted, if it is possible to have it contradicted, but I maintain it against all comers, without fear of successful refutation. I have listened here for days to the remarks that have been made about the glorious way in which these Ritualists have preached the Gospel to the poor, and you have been called upon repeatedly to endorse them; or if you have not been called on to endorse them, you have been called upon at least to connive at them, because of their good works in thus preaching the Gospel to the poor. I claim, sir, that there is no monopoly of devotion, of self-sacrifice, of zeal, or of desire to preach the Gospel to the poor in any branch, or side, or shade, or color, or faction, of this Church. There is a universal desire to preach the Gospel to the poor, and we will not admit that there is a monopoly of that desire possessed by the party that are at present before us. Whatever may be the case with you here, where sinners are plentiful and the raw material is abundant, and therefore one, or two, or three, or a dozen, as far as I know, Ritualistic churches may be very useful in overtaking some of the work which all the other organizations of a religious kind in this great city cannot reach, in the newer portion of the country, where men are not led by show, nor governed by virtue, nor educated and trained success-

fully, at least the most intelligent of them, by any system of symbolism, there to a very great extent we find that the evil meets us in the face; for what is our work in that place? We are sent to the country to preach the Gospel of peace, to heal the wounded of a sectarian and divided Christendom, to bring back to the primitive and Apostolic faith and Church the thousands coming into that land who have no religious home and no religious bond, driven hither and thither at the mercy of the winds and waves of contending sentiments, infidel literature, and infidel lecturers—persons who have no home and no hope in that great land of ours. We are sent there to preach to these people, as I say, the Gospel of peace; to show them an organization that is divine, an authority which they may rightfully be called on to respect; a religion, a literature, a system of doctrines, of Ritual, and worship, which can command their sympathy, their respect, and their reverence. And I say that when these persons come in there, those Ritualists that have been referred to put up their shows, and exhibit their genuflections, and place before the eyes of the people their daubs and pictures, and tinsel shadows, and they do distract the minds of the people, and they do destroy the influence, as far as they can, of the Church, and they do show us not to be a Jerusalem that is at unity within herself, but a Jerusalem that is divided, shattered, and split by contending principles, contending views, and contending practices.

Therefore, I maintain that there is a necessity for legislation on this question. And for another reason: We feel, further, that this Church is a teaching Church; she is an *ecclesia docens*—she is sent forth to this land to teach, not the mutterings of some toothless old woman, as she has been irreverently represented—no, sir; but, with distinction of language, with clearness, precision, and accuracy of statement, to lay down the principles not only of religion, but of doctrine, and of discipline, and of worship, to command the homage, command the reverence, and command the respect of the multitudes that she is thus sent to teach. How can she teach if she has no definite system to communicate? Is it a matter of indifference whether the incense be wafted or the crucifix set up, or an altar reared, with relays and tiers of shelves, with secret boxes to hold relics or reserved sacraments, as the case may be, or whatever else it may be for which these strange things—strange in our eyes, strange in our land, strange in our day—are placed in some of the churches that are called Protestant Episcopal? No, sir, she cannot teach if she allow these things. She must lay down some law, some principle, some kind of statement which intelligent people can reasonably be expected to understand; and she must give power and authority to enforce obedience to her edicts. I therefore hold that there is a necessity for legislation on the subject. The next point I have alluded to is, What shall be the method of that legislation?

Now, sir, I am opposed to the Canon which has been reported by the Committee, because it enters into specifications of particulars. I hold that position is not solid for two reasons. In the first place, you never can draft a Canon excluding certain things by negative statements which shall be so comprehensive, so exhaustive in its qualifications, as that nobody may be able to evade its provisions. Something will have been forgotten, and whatever is not specifically forbidden will be considered as to be tolerated, and you will therefore have ingenious individuals with a slight twist in the spine constantly doing this and constantly doing that, and pleading that you have made a Canon as specific as you could or as you dared, but which does not reach the case

in question. It is impossible to make a Canon of specific particulars which shall by any possibility reach within a hundred miles of the necessities of the case. I am opposed, therefore, to these specifications for this reason. I am opposed to the particular specifications in this Canon for another reason, because those things there prohibited are not now allowed in this Church, because there is a law already in existence by which those things are virtually forbidden. Why exact another Canon to condemn that which all reasonable men now acknowledge to be condemned? Who pleads that incense is permitted in our Church? I should like to see him get up and plead the case. Who pleads that the crucifix is a proper ornament in our Church? I am not aware that anybody maintains the position. Who pleads that adoration to or towards the consecrated elements—for you see the Canon is not specific as to the presence of Christ therein, but "To or towards the sacred elements"—where is the materialist, where the idolater who will for one instant say that he maintains such a position to be in any way possible held, with the greatest latitude of toleration, within our present Church law? Nothing of the kind. Therefore, I maintain that these specifications are simply nugatory and futile. You have cumbered your Canon with a number of things which you have no business to introduce, because the Church having omitted all these things at the Reformation, and never by word, or act, or deed, or sign, given even a hint or intimation that they might be restored, has excluded them, and the man who introduces them is in the direct teeth of the history and of the prestige and Constitution of this Church of ours.

I hold further that the amendment submitted by the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin is the only possible solution of this question which this House can ever hope to reach. What is it that you need? You need not a cast-iron system, but you need a system of living agency, a living voice, to interpret those things which are doubtful or inexpedient—a living voice blessed and gifted with authority and prerogative, enlarged and defended in the exercise of that authority. I hold that the amendment submitted by the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin is the exact thing you need. It does away with those obnoxious specifications which in my judgment would be simply ridiculous to enact, and it constitutes the Bishop—or rather, I should say, it recognizes the Bishop, for it could not constitute him such—that the Church has already done—as the proper fountain of authority, the Ordinary of the Diocese, the rightful source of influence and power in these questions, and recognizing this by the enactment of your Canon you give him just what he has not now the power to enforce, canonical obedience, and to compel the refractory to submit to his godly judgment and admonition. They will now tell you that the judgment is not godly, and therefore, they cannot possibly submit to it; but, sir, if you give them a Canon which will lay it down as their bounden duty in this Church to obey such admonition they will then be compelled to admit that it is not only godly, but binding, and perhaps that may be the more important element of the two. I hold therefore that the amendment is worthy, on that ground, of the acceptance of this House.

But I ask the patience of the House for a moment or two longer, while I deliver another portion of my argument. I maintain that the Bishop, as described in this amendment, is the proper source of authority in the questions contemplated. Now I will give my reason. When God, by the enactment of the Eternal Word, veiled his Godhead in human flesh, and entered into the limitations of a Son of

Man, we know well he was then the centre and the focus of all law, of all knowledge, and of all wisdom, of all revelation with regard to the Father and the duty of the souls of men towards Him. We know that the scattered rays of past illumination gathered into Him as their appropriate focus, and we know that from Him radiated out through all the dark places of the earth the light which has since made peaceful and bright the hopes of men, as they have risen up here and there, and laid hold upon the power of salvation which He has revealed. We know, further, that He delegated to His Apostolic College certain of these powers in measure. The Holy Spirit had been given to Him without measure; and in Him therefore dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead properly, and all power and all authority were vested in Him. To His disciples He allowed to flow down such measure and degree of teaching power, of disciplinary power, of authoritative power to enact laws, that they should be not only the teachers of mankind, but further the disciplinarians of the Church; and having thus organized this body and commissioned His messengers, He sent them forth into the world. We all know how, in the Apostolic College already referred to, the first council, described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, there was the enactment of certain laws, the execution of certain disciplinary powers, the issuance of an encyclical letter which came forth from the Apostles and the Elders and the brethren—the joint action of both Houses, if I may so express myself.

We feel, as we pass on further, this point, which I am anxious to press upon the mind of the House, that while we have in the earliest age all authority, all power, vested thus in the Apostolic College, we have this point, worthy of your close attention, that each of the Apostles, in their separate districts and jurisdictions, had the power to teach and to exercise discipline as to each of them should seem best, but not so but that they were amenable in the end to the conciliary action and correction, if need be, of the whole Apostolic College—a position which I do not think is likely to be disputed. We find then that as the Apostles hand down their authority and their jurisdiction to Timothy and Titus and the rest, there was given to the individual Bishops in their individual jurisdictions power not only to ordain elders in every city, but to “reprove, rebuke, exhort,” not only laity but clergy, “with all long-suffering and doctrine,” to set in order the very point we are at present engaged upon—to set in order the things that are wanting, to issue mandates and give laws for government, and hold themselves responsible to the discipline of all the body with which they had specifically to do.

Then, as we pass on down through the ages, we find this very interesting point—and I need not, before an audience of the learned character of that which I now address, attempt for an instant to go into detail in this matter; nobody will dispute the position, I apprehend—that each Bishop had the authority in his own Diocese not only to preach the Gospel but to exercise discipline among his clergy; and it was not until after the lapse of some centuries that this power began gradually to be curtailed, to be reduced by the voluntary concession of the Bishops themselves; and as things went on divisions began to come into play. During the power of the Roman Empire, of course it was all one vast people, so to speak, though diverse in their language and character; but when they began to disintegrate and go to pieces these different opinions came to the surface, and then the Church in the different nations began also to look after its rights, and to claim from the Bishops some surrender of their acknowledged prerogative, and so in the Council of Toledo

in 589 we find that the law with regard to discipline and with regard to ceremony was finally settled for France and Spain. Why? Because it was not considered expedient that the minds of the ignorant and the unlettered should be distressed and disturbed by diverse systems of Ritual observance, lest they should come to the conclusion that different doctrine was taught or that schism was countenanced in the Church of God. Thus it was that uniformity of practice began to be established.

We pass on to later times. We find in England the use of Sarum and other uses; and at the period of the Reformation they were all gathered together into one. Those things which were then knowingly, designedly, of set purpose, omitted from the Book of Common Prayer, were done so I say advisedly, and the man who will venture now to reintroduce the emblems or the symbols of those mediæval superstitions or their expression in whatsoever way, by ceremony or otherwise, is a renegade to the Church of the Reformation, and to our brethren in this noble land of ours.

I, therefore, hold that it has been satisfactorily and sufficiently established that the Bishop was in primitive times the proper officer for the execution of these rules; that when time continued to advance on, and nations began to assume their independence, then nations legislated to a certain extent upon the Ritual observances of their Churches, the Bishops yielding a certain portion of their acknowledged prerogative as a matter of free concession on their part. And, sir, when we come down to still later times, we find the same thing still continue, for thus the first Book of King Edward distinctly recognizes the Bishop, or the Ordinary, as the proper authority in such questions. I admit it has been left out from our Book, and some have pleaded its omission as an argument. I maintain the argument is fallacious, and I will tell you why. Because we know from the resolutions which have been passed and are to be found upon your Journal, we know from the action of this House and the other, that we have recognized—not constituted, but recognized—a power already existing in the Bishops upon this question. In 1868 it was confessed that the Bishops were the proper parties in the exercise of their Divine commission to carry into execution these laws for the suppression of extravagancy. We have, in the resolution of the last Convention already referred to, made the grand acknowledgment that the Bishops in their respective Dioceses are the lawfully constituted authority, and are deemed efficient for the settlement and correcting of all these disputatious questions.

Now, sir, what do we ask you to do? We ask you to enact a Canon which is confessedly a temporary measure pending full constitutional action by a commission of revision—a commission which, I hope, will be appointed by this House and the other. Pending that proper constitutional measure, we ask you to enact a Canon to do what? To give force to your own resolution; not, as it is rumored to have been said, to give backbone to your Bishops. I repudiate the taunt, and fling back with contempt the indignity; but I do maintain that it is necessary for you—this body here in Convention, with the other House—to put yourselves right upon the record, and to confess to the world that you are Protestant, and, far better, that you are Episcopal; and when you have thus confessed by power of Canon the authority which is already existing in your Bishops, they will have the opportunity of its exercise. You have, by your present lame legislation, rendered it almost impossible for your Bishops to execute the law. I am utterly opposed to the making of spies of your Presbyters. Let the knowledge come to

the Bishop's ear any way it may. Make it his duty with the Standing Committee, his properly constituted advisory council, to investigate the matter; and then, if you will give them this simple Canon, it will not be in the power of the enemy, from whatever side he come, whether from Rome or Geneva, to stamp a stigma upon your Episcopate, and say that it lacks backbone. Give the Bishops the power to carry into execution that which they have already existing in theory. Give them the power of law. Some of these men now say, "We will not obey you; we do not acknowledge your power; we deny altogether your power in the premises; we will follow after any fit practice, although it be not a particular practice of this Church." O sir! but all these men will obey law. They will not obey resolutions; they will not follow advice; they will not take counsel together; but they will obey law, and if they do not they know the consequences. And I want it, further, not left to the option of your Bishop, whether he shall investigate or not. He may be a very meek-souled Christian man, and, thank God, we have plenty of them; we may have a Bishop whose heart is averse to strife and who loves peace, and who may therefore be induced to leave alone those things that are causing disturbance and unrest. Make it his duty to settle the question, to investigate the cause of rumor, to examine whether there be any solid ground of complaint, and then you will have quieted this disturbance.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, it is with no little embarrassment that I now rise to speak to this body, after the very eloquent addresses which we have this morning heard. I thank God that we have men in the Church who can stir up one's heart as the reverend brother who just now sat down, and I may say, also, as the reverend brother who spoke yesterday for so long a time. I agree with both of them, in part, in what they said; but I regret to say that I am bound to differ in some points which they made, and which led them to conclusions to which I cannot come. I am opposed to the Canon as proposed by the Committee on Canons, and I will just state my reasons very briefly; I am also for specific legislation.

I think, Mr. President, that the eloquent appeal against specific legislation by the last speaker, who followed in the track of my eloquent brother from Wisconsin, is one that will not be sustained by this body, and for the reason that specific legislation has already been had upon this subject, and the matters upon which we are to legislate are matters adjudicated. I do not mean adjudicated in the court of conscience, which should, I think, bind all Christian men, when we solemnly resolved that we would not countenance any practices which symbolized Ritualism, and when we invited the House of Bishops to give us their paternal advice, which they gave in the Pastoral; but I mean adjudicated in England by the highest courts. Elevation of the elements in the Lord's Supper, adoration, genuflection, prostration, in so many words have been before the courts, and have been specifically declared to be unlawful; and we ask you now to do what? To declare by Canon that your words were not mere words; that when you invoked the paternal advice of the Bishops you did not merely pass a resolution on paper; and that you came here, not to do, as the reverend brother from Albany so eloquently tried to impress upon us, something in order to satisfy outside parties, that we are all frightened out of our wits, that there is no necessity to legislate, that there were no Ritualists on this floor or elsewhere hardly! No, sir; we do not come here to satisfy outside parties; but when I read

the Pastoral of the House of Bishops, and the addresses of nearly all the Bishops of the Church, when I read the resolutions which were solemnly passed by almost every Diocesan Convention which sent us here, I cannot for a moment suppose that when we come together here we can throw in one breath all this to the winds by saying it is a mere panic.

But let me come to the point. I beg first to have read for me the Canon on Ritual which I proposed, which will be found on the thirty-second page of THE DAILY CHURCHMAN, of the 12th of October. That Canon specifies some things, and I will ask the Secretary to read it, together with a proviso to the first section, which I have added, and which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

"Canon of Ritual Uniformity.

"Sec. 1. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects toward which adoration is to be made, in or after the prayer of consecration, or in the act of administering, or in conveying them to or from the communicants; bowings, crossings, genuflections, prostrations, reverences, bowing down upon or kissing the Lord's Table, and kneeling, except as allowed, provided for, or directed by Rubric or Canon; and any gesture, posture, or act, implying such adoration, and any ceremony not prescribed as part of 'the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion;' likewise the use at any administration of the Holy Communion of any Hymns, Prayers, Collects, Epistles, or Gospels other than those appointed in the authorized formularies of the Church, are hereby forbidden.

"Provided, That nothing in this Canon shall be construed as forbidding the customary offertory anthem accompanying the reverently bringing and humbly presenting and placing upon the Holy Table the alms and other devotions of the people.

"Sec. 2. In all matters pertaining to the Public Worship of the Church, to the ornaments, arrangements, and appointments of the Holy Table, and in everything connected with Ritual in the performance of Divine Service, including the vestments to be used, about which there is no specific direction in the Book of Common Prayer, or the Offices and Ordinal thereto appended, or in any legislation, General or Diocesan, of this Church, the admonition or judgment of the Bishop of any Diocese, given in writing, shall be regarded as binding, to be followed and obeyed by every minister of that Diocese."

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Now, Mr. President, this Canon certainly specifies, and it specifies in words not selected by myself, but taken from the House of Bishops, which they in their wisdom—and I think they are just as wise as we are—at the last General Convention proposed to us. For reasons stated in a preamble to this Canon when I introduced it, we did not then think that the time had come for legislation. We hoped the paternal advice of the Bishops in the Pastoral would be sufficient; but now, finding it is not, we must legislate, and legislating I propose to legislate in the very words which the Bishops themselves suggested to us at the last General Convention. The proviso, I think, will suggest itself to every one as very desirable—namely, the customary sentence at the time of the presenting of the offerings at the Holy Table. The additional section is one which I think provides for all that is good in the pending Canon, and for which my reverend brother from Nebraska so eloquently pleaded, and it was also impressed upon us by my eloquent brother from Wisconsin, yesterday, namely, that the Bishops should have this rightful authority—an authority not given them, an autho-

rity only declared, an authority which in the sight of God they are to exercise, an authority which they are to exercise as Bishops, unencumbered, unembarrassed by a Standing Committee. And why? Because if you divide the responsibility, put the Standing Committee with them, what will you have? You will have two bodies perhaps disagreeing. Then if they disagree the thing falls to the ground. Where is your Bishop's authority? If they agree, then as was very well stated by my reverend friend and brother from Wisconsin, what will be the opinion of the next Standing Committee? Will it not be a bone of contention continually in a Diocese, one saying, "This Standing Committee has not given a right judgment, and therefore we must have a new Standing Committee the next time," and another saying, "Now, we must retain this Standing Committee, because it is perfectly sound." You will introduce an element of discord into the Church, and you will but fan the difficulty and the trouble, not once but continuously.

But some will say this is giving too much power to the Bishops. Giving power! No; you are only declaring that they have the power, and, as my reverend brother said, it only takes away the quibble whether their admonition is "godly" or not. You thus debar any one from setting himself up against his Bishop in the rightful discharge of his duty inherent in him by saying it is not godly.

But it does something more, and this with me weighs very much. It provides not simply for the one side but for the other, not simply for excess but for any deficiency that there may be in conducting the service. It does not make the Bishop simply the power to exercise discipline against one section of the Church, but against all the Church. If a clergyman in the matters not expressed or provided for by the Prayer-Book or the Ordinal, or the legislation of the Church, general or Diocesan, is guilty either of excess of Ritual or of not having enough, the Bishop can give him his godly judgment, and then, if the Bishop shows himself as not having a good judgment, you can remedy it at the next Diocesan Convention, or at the next General Convention, and then his power ceases; not that it is taken from him, but it is kept under that restriction which the Bishops themselves have been willing to become parties to in consenting to Conventions to legislate.

Now, let us turn to the Canon before us. What does it do? It not only affords a bone of contention, but, in my humble judgment, it encroaches upon the Constitution. I speak this with the greatest deference, for on that Committee there are men who are honored, and deservedly honored, by the Church. The Chairman of that Committee we all feel proud of, and we thank God that He has preserved him so long to be here, and to act so nobly and so ably for the Church of God; and yet, as I do not believe in the infallibility of any man or set of men, I must express my view, and I hope I shall be pardoned when I differ from him.

I contend that not in so many words but in spirit it encroaches upon the Constitution. Let us see. The investigation is to take place by whom? By the Bishop upon consulting with his Standing Committee. If the Bishop and Standing Committee are for investigation, come to successful conclusion, they are to act, and if they act the party must obey, and if he does not obey he receives, what he certainly deserves, the reward of disobedience, which is punishment. Now I direct your attention to this clause in Article 6 of the Constitution:

"In every Diocese, the mode of trying Presbyters and Deacons may be instituted by the Convention of the Diocese."

This has been interpreted by the Committee on

Amendments to the Constitution to mean that we are prevented from instituting or establishing Courts of Appeal, because the trying of Presbyters and Deacons is lodged in the Dioceses. Are we not here providing for trials? Are we not here providing for a mode by which we are to reach offenders, and what is this but trying? Is this consistent with the spirit of the Constitution? I submit it is hardly consistent with the letter of the Constitution.

Take this Canon, as it is, giving us a few generalities, introducing any act of adoration symbolizing false doctrine in the service, as the crucifix. I do not wish a crucifix, I have it not, and I hope I never will have it; and if God preserves my reason I never will introduce it or suffer it in my churches as long as I am connected with them. I have no crucifix about my church, and I hope I will never see it; and yet I must agree with my brother from Wisconsin, however much these things may be undesirable, however much they may be wrong, because they do something else, they do not do what this Canon declares—symbolize false doctrine. If we express ourselves in words of solemn enactment, let us use words which cannot be misunderstood. Do not let us commit ourselves before the Church and the world by legislating that certain things teach and symbolize false doctrine which do not teach and symbolize false doctrine.

I may be blinded. Old men are very fond of their children, and sometimes fonder of their younger ones, and they become very much attached to them. I know I am attached to mine, and the older I get the more I love them; and perhaps, this being my last child, having myself proposed it, though it is not original, I am in love with it; but I really do think that the Canon which I introduced very early in the session, and which modestly I moved be referred to the Committee on Canons, is less liable to objection than the one which the Committee on Canons have introduced, and therefore I hold that it should be adopted. I move it, Mr. President, as a substitute.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia, in the Chair). It cannot be moved now. We have already two amendments and one substitute, and therefore it must be ruled out of order.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I give notice of my intention to move it at the proper time, when I can in accordance with the rules do so.

Mr. President, there is one more point, and only one more, that I wish to make with regard to the Canon proposed by the Committee on Canons. I stated that, in my opinion, it runs very strongly on the heels of the Constitution. I think also it runs counter to a provision in the Canons, and I will ask the Convention to turn to page 86 of the Digest, to the Canon "Of Offences for which Ministers may be tried and punished," and to "Proceedings on Public Rumor." You will find that there it is said that if there be public rumor of a minister of this Church living in the habitual disuse of public worship or of the Holy Eucharist, according to the offices of this Church, or of being guilty of any or either of the offences enumerated in number so and so, among which offences, you remember, is a breach of the ordination vow; and if you make these things a breach of the ordination vow, it comes among the offences and the modes by which a clergyman is tried; and then the Canon says:

"It shall be the duty of the Bishop, or, if there be no Bishop, of the clerical members of the Standing Committee, to see that an enquiry be instituted as to the truth of such public rumor."

Here the Canon says how public rumor is to be reached. It is to be reached by the Bishop institut-

ing enquiry, and if there be no Bishop, by the clerical members of the Standing Committee. Does the Canon reported to us by the Committee on Canons do this? No. It says the Bishop shall call in the Standing Committee, and does not even say that he shall call in the clerical members of the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee in most Dioceses, we know, is composed of both clergy and laity, and they are to be called in to do what? To enquire as to the truth of such a rumor. Now, I contend that this Canon is entirely contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution and directly in the teeth of this Canon. I ask the pardon of the Convention for detaining them so long.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey, obtained the floor.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Will the Deputy from New Jersey allow me to make a motion to facilitate business?

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Certainly.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the order of the day concerning the Hymnal be discharged, and that the report of the Hymnal Committee, and the papers appertaining to it, become the order of the day immediately after the debate be finished.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the order of the day appointed for two o'clock this day be discharged, and that the same subject be made the order of the day immediately after the conclusion of the matter now before the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I now move that the vote be taken upon this Canon of Ritual at four o'clock to-day, the Committee on Canon having the right to close the debate.

Rev. Mr. STONE, of Delaware. I move to amend that by saying "at eleven o'clock to-morrow."

The PRESIDENT. Before putting the question, I beg to suggest to the House, knowing as I do that many gentlemen desire to speak on this subject, whether it would not be right and proper to fix a shorter limit to the speeches. Thirty minutes will certainly not allow half the persons who desire to speak to be heard, and some of them as offering amendments will be entitled to be heard. The question is upon the amendment that the debate be closed at eleven o'clock to-morrow.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the motion of the Deputy from Long Island, that the debate close at four o'clock this afternoon, and that the Committee on Canons be allowed to close the debate.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I think the Committee on Canons ought to be allowed the last fifteen minutes.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I move that the speeches be limited to fifteen minutes. The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move that the last fifteen minutes be reserved for Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH CANADIAN CHURCH.

A message (No. 43), from the House of Bishops, announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs with the House of Deputies in the adoption of the resolution contained in Message No. 32, from the said House, with the following amendment, viz.: That in the third resolution the words 'suspension or' be omitted, so that the said third resolution shall read,

'Resolved, That on the deposition of any clergyman,' etc.

The SECRETARY. This refers to the communicating of the notice of suspension or deposition of any clergyman to the Bishops of the Canadian Church, and is a part of the resolutions adopted by the Joint Committee to confer with the Canadian Deputation.

The PRESIDENT. This message is a mere formal matter, and may as well be concurred in now.

The message was concurred in.

PART OF CALIFORNIA TO BE A MISSIONARY DISTRICT.

A message (No. 47) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, The Diocese of California by deliberate action of the Bishop and Convention thereof has for urgent and sufficient reasons declared its desire to establish its northern limits on the southern line of Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Sacramento, Amador, and El Dorado counties; and whereas this House is sufficiently assured of the assent of the parishes lying north of the said boundary line; and whereas, while grave doubts are entertained by many of the power under our Constitution to permanently alter the territorial extent of a Diocese in this form, yet impressed by the great necessities of the Church in that Diocese and of the justice of her claim for prompt relief. Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the General Convention hereby signifies its consent and agreement to the limitations of the jurisdiction of the Bishop and Convention of the Diocese of California within the limits above indicated, until such constitutional amendment and legislation thereunder can be secured as are necessary to remove the doubts aforesaid, and that in the mean time the territory north of the limits aforesaid and within the State of California be held and treated as Missionary Jurisdiction."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. May I ask consent of the House to put the California matter through? The principles are the same that we have discussed in the Texas case. I move, if there be no objection, that the House concur in the message of the House of Bishops, No. 47.

The motion was agreed to.

The hour of half-past one having arrived, a recess was taken till two o'clock P.M., when the House resumed its session.

DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNICANTS.

A message (No. 49) from the House of Bishops announced that it appointed as members of the Joint Committee to consider and report what action, if any, is desirable in relation to the matter of the godly discipline of communicant members of this Church, the Bishop of Delaware, the Bishop of Easton, and the Bishop of Pittsburgh.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

A message (No. 50) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the amendment to Section 1 of Canon 1 of Title III., contained in Message No. 35 from the House of Deputies, for the reason that inasmuch as the rules and orders of each House of the General Convention are in the power of said House, no joint action or legislation on such rules and orders appears to be necessary or expedient."

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to put in a report now. ["No objection."]

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom were referred sundry amendments to Article III. of the Constitution, proposed by Dr. Leeds, of Maryland. Mr. Montgomery, of Georgia, Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland, *et al.*, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report: That in the opinion of the Committee it is desirable to retain the provisions of said articles, requiring the House of Bishops to signify to this House their approbation or disapprobation (the latter with their reasons in writing) within a specified time, to the end that this House may know what has been done; and in case of non-concurrence, the reasons therefor, which will enable the House to meet the issue thus raised.

"Also to retain that provision which makes any Bishop present *ex officio* a member of the House until there are three or more Bishops in attendance—for surely, in such a case, such Bishop or Bishops would make most valuable members of this House. And it is not advisable to dispense with such assistance.

"The Committee submit the following resolution: 'Resolved, That it is inexpedient, at this time, to adopt any of the said amendments proposed to Article III. of the Constitution.'

I would ask consent to have this put on its passage now.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

CANON ON RITUAL.

The House resumed the consideration of the Canon on Ritual, reported by the Committee on Canons.

Mr. HAYDEN, of Connecticut. I move that in the further debate on this subject, as our time is so limited, the laity be allowed a reasonable opportunity to present their side of this case. I do not wish to speak myself, but there are members of the laity who desire to speak, and, I hope, they will have an opportunity. I think they ought to be heard somewhat in reference to this matter before this debate is closed.

The PRESIDENT. I think the suggestion is eminently worthy of attention; and I would further suggest that, although gentlemen are allowed fifteen minutes for their speeches, they are not compelled to occupy the whole fifteen minutes. [Laughter.] They may say, perhaps, in five or ten minutes all that will be very pertinent to the question. I suggest that for the benefit of all, and I shall be most happy, and the House will be most happy to hear from the learned laymen, who are quite as much interested in this matter as the clergy can be. Dr. Clark is entitled to the floor, and will please proceed.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Mr. President, since you have given me so useful a hint, I shall not only try to take it myself, but I hope the rest of the members who will speak will take it also. Fifteen minutes is not time to make a speech in, and I have no desire therefore to attempt to occupy the time in making a speech. I propose to call attention to the fact of the existence of Ritualism, and the proposed remedy with which to meet it. There are but two pronounced Ritualists in this House, so far as I know. One comes from the West and the other comes from the East. One represents the Clerical Deputies, the other the Lay Deputies. So it is hardly worth while for us to think or talk much about them. But there are in other portions of the Church, and there are in portions of the Church not far from us—(on account of the courtesy we are receiving from the Diocese of New York, I wish it

to be understood that I am speaking of the Diocese which I have the honor of representing, and not of practices which are going on here from time to time)—evidences of Ritualism, of Romanism, of Romish practices in some of our Dioceses which ought to be met, and met at once. I hold in my hand a document from which I propose to make a few brief extracts, entitled "A few Suggestions to Church-goers," "Observances for the Devout Laity." I will only take a few points from this, because I do not wish to consume time in reading the whole:

"(1.) *Bowing to the Altar.*

"On entering and leaving the Church it has always been the custom to bow toward the Altar, not of course as paying any worship toward it, but both because it is God's Throne, and as an act of adoration to Him. . . . So Christians worship toward the Holy Altar, and bow down before it, taking that at all times as a visible symbol of His presence, which is the appointed place of His actual presence in the Holy Communion."

"*Bowing during Divine Service.*"

I am skipping a large portion of this document.

"The faithful bow at the name of Jesus *whenever* it occurs in the course of Divine service, in devout adoration of that name at which, as St. Paul says, 'Every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, etc. . . .

"Also in the *Nicene Creed* it is customary to bow (and some kneel) at the clause 'And was made man' in veneration of the ineffable condescension of God the Son in stooping to become man for our salvation.

"*Kneeling—Standing—the Sign of the Cross.*

"Kneeling is the appointed attitude of prayer, standing of praise, sitting of instruction; in all three facing the Altar. In a Low celebration, all kneel *throughout*, except at the Gospel when all should stand, in reverence for 'the good tidings of salvation.' A High celebration being longer, sitting at the Epistle is allowable."

Having never been to either a High or Low celebration, I do not know what they are.

"The custom of making the sign of the cross is as old as Christianity itself, and is mentioned by the earliest writers. Those who practise this venerable custom do it before and after engaging in public or private prayer, when they invoke the Holy Trinity, saying, 'In the name of the Father,' as with the fingers of the right hand they touch the forehead, because the Father is the head of all things; 'and of the Son,' as they touch the left breast, because the Son was begotten by the Father; 'and of the Holy Ghost,' as they draw from left to the right across the breast, because the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. . . ."

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

"(1.) *The Altar and its Appointments.*

"The altar, approached by steps, is raised above the level of the Church, to represent the *Mount Calvary*, upon which our Lord died, and is mounted by a cross to remind us of His crucifixion upon Calvary. On either side of the Altar-cross are placed two lights, teaching us that Christ is the true 'Light of the World,' and likewise on either side are placed vases of flowers, teaching us, among other things, that Christ is the 'Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley.'

"(2.) *The Consecration and after.*

"Here begins the most solemn part of the Office. Up to this part Christ is not objectively present, but at the words, 'THIS IS MY BODY—THIS IS MY BLOOD,' Christ comes to the altar under the form of Bread

and Wine. At this point the faithful bow or prostrate themselves in deepest adoration of Him who veiled His Godhead under the mean form of a little Infant, when the Wise Men knelt and worshipped Him, and who now veils both His Godhead and manhood under the mean and common forms in the Blessed Sacrament. If they should by any chance be obliged to enter or leave church, or pass before the Altar after the prayer of consecration, they will also kneel on one knee in the same adoring spirit."

There is something here similar to the prayers read by the Deputy from Pennsylvania, and which I therefore omit.

"The faithful, if they have communicated at the early celebration, stay all through the mid-day celebration for the purpose of *adoration*, but not to receive the Blessed Sacrament again.

"If any of the Blessed Sacrament remains on the Altar during the singing of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the faithful bow reverently at the words '*We worship Thee*.'"

Now, sir, I understand that this document was placed in the pews of a certain church for the edification of the people who attend that church; and not far from that church I have attended a service which it was utterly impossible for me, as a Protestant Episcopalian, to unite in, because I could neither understand the motions nor hear the words, the service being intoned, or, as a late Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, said to a gentleman who was in the habit of intoning the service, "Is that what you call intoning?" "Yes." "I call that very bad reading." [Laughter.] Whether it was reading or intoning, it is difficult to say. The minister's back was towards the people; there were men bowing and posturing; there were men whom I saw taking themselves to pieces, after the service take off their robes, and do a variety of other things which were certainly not in accordance with the usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Sir, Ritualism does exist; it has infested and infected our Church; it is doing a vast amount of mischief; it is hindering the growth of the Church, and, going on at this rate, we shall have but few men to stand and protect our rights or preach the Gospel as it should be preached throughout our pulpits. Only sixty men each year are likely to be added to our ministry for the next three years; and I believe one cause of this great falling off is the existence of this very thing in our Church. Men who are men are not fond of millinery and toys. Men who want to preach the Gospel of Christ, and who want to produce an effect upon the world, are not men who are spending their time in making little crosses, in adorning their persons, in tying ropes around their bodies, in making themselves conspicuous for the show they make rather than because of what they can utter which is worthy of being heard.

Are my fifteen minutes up, because if so I must go on to something else?

The PRESIDENT. Pretty nearly up.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. Now for the remedy. I hope I shall be able to get this in, because I stand here the advocate of the view presented by my learned and eloquent brother from the Diocese of Wisconsin [Rev. Dr. De Koven]. His views in this respect—I mean in respect to the Canon on Ritual—suit me a great deal better than the Canon which was reported to this House by the Committee on Canons, and I stand here, therefore, to advocate the passage of his amendment. I read it:

"If any Bishop has reason to believe that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or sym-

bolizing doctrines not in accordance with those of this Church, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction, it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his council of advice, and with them to investigate the matter."

I do not believe in sending any two Clergymen around as spies; Paul Prys, as they have been termed in this House. I do not believe in giving to any two or three laymen the power to bring any clergyman up. If that were the law, I should have been brought up I suppose forty times, not because I do not perform the services precisely as I did twenty-eight years ago, when I entered the ministry, but because there are some men who have become so mixed up in their views of the service that they do not recognize it when it is properly performed in the old-fashioned Connecticut way, which I believe is considered orthodox.

"And if, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that doctrines not in accordance with those of this Church have, in fact, been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid," etc.

Now, sir, I feel that we shall be perfectly safe if we adopt that Canon. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows better than anybody on this floor what Ritualism is. He wants to stop it. He proposes here a Canon with which he hopes he can stop it. I hope he can, too. Now, sir, I will take your hint and sit down.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, it is with unfeigned diffidence that I attempt to speak on this subject. For more than thirty-five years I have been accustomed to be one of the audience and receive the doctrine from the pulpit, scarcely enquiring in doctrinal points whether it be right or whether it be wrong; but since I have been elected a delegate to this Convention I have read the various communications which have been made on this subject of Ritualism and on this subject of High Church and of Low Church, and I have tried to form some opinion, and I confess to you that, if I know myself, I am neither High Church nor Low Church; I am no Ritualist; I am simply a Churchman desiring to see the Prayer-Book carried out in all its purity.

Having thus defined my position, I come before you to speak in respect to the Canon which has been presented by the Committee on Canons. The report that they made impressed me. It is evidently an effort on their part to do something, and yet to keep within proper bounds. I feel since I have been here that I may say the universal sentiment of our Church is against any extremes in our religion. The feeling of this House is against Ritualism. I feel that that is now the common sentiment and the common opinion of the Church from one end of the Union to the other. And when that Committee said, "We have had divers opinions in our Committee, and finally we have agreed upon certain things, or upon a Canon, and in that Canon we have all agreed," it favorably impressed me, for there was nothing in that Canon to which I could take exception. But I have examined it, and I have examined it carefully, and I do object to it now, particularly after the analysis which it has received in this debate. I object to it because in the various specifications I do not myself understand what is symbolized and what is not. Using incense, I do not understand, unless some one will get up and explain it. I have seen lights in the church; I supposed they were candles. I suppose that meant "we want more light" [laughter], but I do not know what theological proposition was thereby involved. There is nothing here about

lights. If I were to see incense offered, I should not know its meaning unless some one told me what it meant. It is true that this Canon is confined entirely to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. I see that therefore it has some hidden meaning that is not explained to me. If men teach false doctrine, it seems to me the Church in some way should explain itself and arraign the minister who preaches false doctrine.

The objection I have now to this thing is that all these propositions are in the negative. I do not think it becomes this Convention to legislate in the negative. We ought to say in the spirit, at all events, "thus saith the Lord"; "verily I say unto you"; "so it shall be, and it shall be not otherwise."

But my objection is not that alone. We have a law, and by that law we should live. We have a Constitution of this Church, and since I have been honored by being made a member of the Prayer-Book Committee, I have examined into this subject. The Ritual cannot be changed except in the form prescribed by the Constitution. Have the members of this Convention given that subject their consideration as carefully as they ought to have done? In the Eighth Article of the Constitution the words are emphatic, distinct, plain, and any one can understand them. After saying that the administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies shall be laid down in the Prayer-Book, the Article proceeds to say:

"No alterations or additions shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer or other offices of the Church, or the Articles of Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention."

In this matter what is here proposed is either an alteration, or it is an addition, or it is a perfect negative, that I do not know how ministers may construe it; but I see very well how a subtle mind can escape all your negative, and laugh at the Convention. The Bishops, a few years ago, explained a term in the office of Infant Baptism. It was in a negative form. Now we have petitions before us to leave it optional with the minister to use it or not to use it, though the explanation was given, and though I suppose that explanation satisfies the conscience of nearly every minister who may use it. I am bringing this as an evidence that we had better go according to the law of the land. We have a law as I say, and by that law let us live. There is no way of escape from this clause in the Constitution, but to construe this Canon as simply explaining the Prayer-Book. I submit to your judgment whether that is not an evasion of the direct letter of the Constitution and also of its spirit. I submit it to candid, conscientious, true men. If it be unconstitutional, how can we do it? This is a compromise proposition. It is evident, it bears upon its face the marks of compromise. I have in my life often found compromise propositions, but I never knew a compromise proposition that was ever satisfactory to either party. A compromise proposition does not satisfy; it does not go far enough for one, and it goes too far for another. When we here are legislating on this subject, shall we not devise some means by which we can come to a proposition which will certainly convey what I think the Church wants, although I do not feel since I have come here that there is as much need of it as I thought existed in the Church before I came here? I do not see but that this Church is perfectly sound on the subject of Ritualism, and I have seen no exhibition of a spirit which would overcome that feeling.

What I have already said prepares me for what I have to offer as a substitute for all this

when it is in order. I shall read it as a part of my argument. I submit it to you. I hope it will be examined by you, and that you will receive it in the spirit I offer it. I offer it as one who would say that if these things mean false doctrine I am against every one of them. I want everything of that kind in the Church stopped; and, thank God, since I came here, I have learned that probably there are not more than four or five churches, at the most, where there are any of these practices that symbolize anything which we think erroneous or strange doctrine. There are only four or five such churches, and there is not one single representative from them here, unless we may call the lay member from Massachusetts a representative of those churches, and he made a speech to which I took but very little exception. Here is the amendment which I propose to offer; I think I have drawn it up with care, and I hope, when it is offered, it will be understood:

"Whereas, There is much feeling in the Church upon the subject of certain ceremonial and practices to be found in some of our churches."

I am glad that they are not to be found to the extent I apprehended.

"And whereas, The subject of liturgy, which lies at the bottom of the said usages, is one of no little difficulty, requiring especial study for its mastery.

"And whereas, This body is too large and has not the time to weigh the many nice points of theology and Ritual on the questions in issue."

I speak of this because, so far are we advanced in the session that it is now impossible for the Committee on Canons or the Committee on the Constitution or the Committee on the Prayer-Book to prepare something to go to all the Dioceses, and come back again at the end of three years.

"And whereas, It is necessary to meet these questions fairly and calmly, so as to guard this Church from error of doctrine, and from strange and unlawful practices. Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it shall be the duty of the President of this body to appoint a committee of three clerical and three lay members of this House, to act with a committee of three on the part of the House of Bishops, who shall, with as little delay as possible, select a commission of learned men, to be composed as they shall think best, which commission shall sit from time to time between this and the reassembling of the General Convention, and shall consider the whole question of the Ritual laws of the Church, and report to the said next General Convention what changes, if any, are needed in our present formularies, and what laws, if any, should be enacted to meet the end herein proposed."

I propose this in order to have the public mind directed to the subject, and the ablest men and the best talent of the Church brought to bear on the subject, to see if there is anything needed to suppress bad practices symbolizing false doctrine. Why are we in such a hurry? This Prayer-Book of ours has stood more than two hundred years. It has stood the test of time. Our Church is eminently conservative.

Sir, I honestly believe that this Church has up to this time, and is destined for all time to come, small it may be in numbers to keep the religion of Jesus Christ pure with all the denominations in this country. They are bound to come to us to see what are the standards of true Christianity. We are the guardians of this vestal fire. Let us not do anything in haste. Let us not offend a good brother. We are not now necessarily compelled to act. Why shall we be guided by this false cry and that false cry? When men tell me that this Church is given up to Ritualism, what do I say? Why, sir, there is a general voice throughout this

Convention that they will not agree to Ritualism, a universal feeling of that kind, and the great difficulty which I see is to be the result of acting with undue haste.

I have been content with the Prayer-Book. The Eucharist is "the difficulty." I have been content with the expressions on that subject. I have been content to take the Lord's Supper in remembrance of His death and passion. That is what my Prayer-Book tells me. But what is the difficulty of those brethren who claim to be advanced? but my judgment is like that of the gentleman who said awhile ago, that instead of it being an advanced, it is rather a retroceding position. Instead of going away from Rome, from which we reformed, it is going back to Rome. I would say plainly that the difficulty in their mind is not in the thing itself. We all understand that the Lord is present in His Supper. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAZLEHURST, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of the laity—

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. I rise to a point of order. My point of order is this: I enquire whether the floor is dealt out by the President now according to the parliamentary rule adopted by the Convention, or by some other rule which he thinks more expedient?

The PRESIDENT. It is according to the parliamentary rule, as well as I know how to administer it.

Mr. HAZLEHURST, of Pennsylvania. I say, Mr. President, that, on behalf of the laity of this Church, I thank you. This is the first opportunity we have had for some time to say some words on this subject. While I thank you, I object to the recognition of me as from the locality of the ancient commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I do not speak upon this question as from any particular locality. I should like to take inspiration of the delegate from Virginia, who, in 1774, stood in the Continental Congress in the City of Independence, and, when asked whether he came from Virginia, said: "No; I am a representative of America." Now, I say to my friends of this body, I speak this afternoon not for the limited locality of the city of Philadelphia or the Diocese of Pennsylvania, but I speak for the Church—the American Church, as broad and as general as the American Union.

What is the question, sir? My good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Shattuck] tells us that there is no such thing as Ritualism. Why, sir, the air is full of it. Every day that we have been in session here (and I have been in this hall for the last two weeks and a half) the subject of Ritualism has been discussed. Every day it has filled this edifice. Up to the time its debate began, we had but few auditors present here, but from the time that commenced the whole building has been filled, and I may say with perfect propriety and without any attempt at compliment, that this beautiful building has been made more beautiful by the discussion of Ritualism. Now, sir, what is it? What are we to discuss? I speak here as a lawyer. It is no objection to me that I happen to be a Philadelphia lawyer. [Laughter.] What is the old law? What is the mischief? And what is the remedy?

First, What is the old law? There is the old law—the good old-fashioned Prayer-Book; and your Canon, I hardly think, has improved it. There it is—the old-fashioned Prayer-Book. The old law binding the Presbyterian is—first, the seventh article of your Constitution; second, the Prayer-Book of 1789; third, the offices of 1792; and last, the much-abused and much-converted articles of 1801. There is the old law. Under that old law the Presbyterian enters the Church with a solemn vow that he will

conform in everything to the doctrines of the Church. He enters your place of worship and, before the assembled congregation, says that he will administer the sacrament, how? According to the doctrines and forms and usages of the Church. If he exhibits it in any other way; if he spreads above your altar the paraphernalia of the juggler and violates the whole Ritual of the Church, what are you to do with him? What would we do with a lawyer who should violate his oath? We, in the City of Philadelphia, take an oath of this kind, that we will stand by the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania; we will stand by the Constitution of the American Union; we will delay no man's cause for lucre or malice, and we will be faithful to the Court as well as to the client. And if the lawyer does not do it he is stricken from the list by the order of the Court.

Now let me tell you, my friends, that this is a question between the laity, if you please, and the clergy; and if any of the clergy cannot conform to the rules and the regulations thus laid down, the laity must take the matter in their own hands. There is no Ritualism, says my distinguished lay friend from Massachusetts; here and there a church, one in this city, and so on. Why, my friends, it is written, as it were, on the bells of the houses, wide and general as the streets throughout the city of New York.

Now we have the law; we have the mischief; and next we have the remedy. Pass this Canon if you please, and I shall certainly vote for it; but it is a very little improvement upon the Rubrics as now laid down in that Book. What are you to do? If a clergyman will not adhere to these rules, there is a way already laid down by which the Bishop of the Diocese can secure conformity to them. There is the law of the Constitution, as I said, the law of the Prayer-Book; and I do not think—I speak it reverently, nay, I say it affectionately—that there is one clergyman who conscientiously, soberly, and truly, would willingly violate a single Canon or Rubric of this Church. Why should they? We are all going on in the same way.

I heard men talk to-day and yesterday of sacramental offices and matters of that kind, which we know very little of in our profession and speak of Eucharistic adoration. Sir, I have been brought up at the feet of William White, and in our ancient Commonwealth we have been taught that there was one sacrifice, a perpetual sacrifice, but that it was once, and only once offered. Now, talk not to me about symbolic representations, and matters of that kind. Let me tell you it is taking us over other pavements than those to which we have been accustomed. It is taking us over tessellated pavements that may probably lead, I will not say to the Vatican, but in some neighborhood like that—tessellated pavements that exhibit mummeries and symbols which we have condemned.

I say that this is a matter in which you and I and all of us have an interest. I have been a quiet, but not an indifferent spectator of these proceedings. I have been on a very important Committee, and I do not think I have been indifferent to the interest of the Church in this body; but I have been quiet. Now I will say that the laity will stand by this Church if every clergyman within the sound of my voice deserts it, and this Church is to be preserved by the laity. I want you to understand that. If the struggle come between the clergy and the Church, we will take the covenant into our keeping. That we will do. No human power shall compel this Ark of the Almighty to go down. If it does go down, we shall carry the banner ourselves.

I should deprecate a struggle in this matter between the laity and the clergy; but if it is inevi-

table, I say let it come; let it come. We have our proposition here [holding up the Prayer-Book]. Luther had his propositions, and what did he do with them? He fastened them upon the castle-gates of Wittenberg and dared Catholic Europe to the controversy. Our proposition is here—the Prayer-Book, dear to me in my very heart of hearts; the Prayer-Book, with all its memories, with all its pleasures, bringing us in full accord and sweet communion with the Reformed Church of England. We cannot battle with our proposition as Luther did with his; but we can lay it upon the Altar, and give our adoration to the Most High God, and preserve it for His sake.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. Mr. President and gentlemen, I have no idea of making a discourse on Ritualism considered philosophically, historically, or theologically; but I wish to say a very few words upon the Canon now before the House.

As to the suggestion that we have no constitutional power to pass such a Canon, I think that after this Committee of thirteen, so reluctant, have ventured to report the Canon, we may allow the constitutional question to rest.

As to the point that we have no need of legislation on this subject, that this evil has been greatly exaggerated, I say that, if we have been sent here to represent the Church on any subject, it is with regard to this matter called Ritualism; if anything is expected of this General Convention, it is that we shall deal in some way with this matter of Ritualism.

And now, sir, with regard to this special Canon, I am free to say that it does not come up to what I regard as the need of the Church at this time; but such is my respect for that Committee, so well convinced am I that there is greater wisdom in the conflicts of opinions among learned and intelligent men such as those who are found on that Committee, that, although I might imagine and do imagine that I might suggest myself an amendment which would greatly improve this Canon, yet, for one, I will bow to their judgment and vote pure and simple for their Canon.

Sir, my first impressions of this Canon being, as I have stated, that it did not meet all the demands of our Church at this time, I listened with great care to the learned gentleman who defended the Canon, and I must say, in all candor, that his defence of it made me doubt as to whether, after all, it would avail much; but when I heard the learned address of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I became satisfied that after all there must be something in the Canon or he never could display such energy in opposition to it.

The great fault which has been found with this Canon in itself has been applied chiefly to two points; the first one strenuously urged is the word "doubtful", and we are asked what are "doubtful doctrines." Now, sir, I do not suppose we are called upon to interpret here this Canon. We may express our individual opinions as to what words in this Canon mean, but they would all go for nothing. It will be the duty of those who administer the Canon to say what the word "doubtful" means. But I do not sympathize with the objection which has been made to this word "doubtful." I think I can see a good meaning in it, and one which is properly applicable to this very subject which we have on hand. "Erroneous doctrines" we understand to be statements of doctrine clearly in conflict with the doctrine of the Church. "Doubtful doctrines" I understand to be statements of doctrine which may naturally give rise to doubts in the minds of those who hear the statements as to whether they are in accordance with the doctrines of the Church. And, sir, I maintain that it is not well-defined and manifestly erroneous doctrines which are causing most trouble

in our Church at this time, but doubtful statements of doctrine, statements of doctrine which create general uneasiness in the minds of Churchmen, uneasiness as to whether there may not be contained in them erroneous and Romish doctrines. And, sir, when we have so able and learned gentlemen as have been found in this Church to make grave statements of doctrines which have been misunderstood, it is now claimed not merely by the simple-minded laity of the Church, but by grave clergymen in the Church, clergymen of eminent ability in the Church, who have supposed that under this form of words there has been dangerous error, I say it is the doubtful doctrines which to a large extent are disturbing the peace of the Church; and when men of the greatest ability after such, as it is claimed, misunderstanding of their words in the statement of doctrine, come forward and explain that they have been misunderstood, what are we to expect from lesser minds in our parish churches venturing to speak unguarded words which, after all, may turn out not to be erroneous, but simply doubtful words? Now, sir, if it should be the effect of such legislation as this that our various clergy should be careful in their doctrinal expressions to keep in the old terminology to which our parishes are accustomed, not to express the old, well-known doctrines of the faith in new terms of doubtful meanings, it would be a good thing for our Church.

And here a point of objection to this Canon is the specifications. Sometimes in listening to the urgent statements we have had here, I have myself been tempted to feel that perhaps it was rather a small matter to be entering into these specifications; but when I find all around numbers of men sedulously exerting themselves to avoid these specifications, I am constrained to believe that there is some virtue in them after all, and that if we lose the specifications we shall lose a large part of the merit of this Canon; and, to apply the true doctrine of my friend from Wisconsin on the right, if we cannot have entire unity and uniformity in all respects, as he went on to say that it was better to have forty uses in this Church than to have forty uses in a single Diocese, I say if we cannot agree in all points in our Church, it will be gaining something to agree upon these four points, that hereafter the minds of churchmen shall no longer be disturbed by these four innovations upon our doctrine.

But, sir, it is said that these specifications, after all, will avail nothing; that, define as we may, there will be astute, learned men capable of walking through any Canon that we shall devise, and have their own way at last. There may be such men; but I am sure when the Church has declared her will in these respects, that the true sons of the Church, the genuine churchmen of this Church, will observe the law, not be studious to find out methods of evading the law. I am sure that will be the feeling of the churchmen of Virginia, and I believe it will be the feeling of sound churchmen in every Diocese of this Church. Therefore I shall not think it will be a vain thing if we may have even this measure of legislation on the subject.

For myself, I cannot of course enter upon the multitude of questions that have been broached here. So well content am I in mind that our chance for meeting the wishes of the Church depends on our adopting this Canon, that I shall take it as I find it, not free from defects, not such as I would have it, but such as our very able Committee have reported it to us; I shall take it pure and simple, without attempt at amendment.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina, obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT. I wish to mention the fact to the House, for the information of persons who desire to speak, that Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland, has laid an amendment before the House which he has had no opportunity of explaining, and as the fifteen minutes assigned to the Committee on Canons will soon be here, I put it to the justice of the House whether Mr. Blanchard should not be heard after Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I must endeavor to select from what I had intended to say only a few points, so as to come within the limited time allowed me; and first of all I would venture to say to those gentlemen who have proposed amendments, that if they are in favor of the principle which is sought to be established by this Canon, they are in fact only defeating that principle, unless they are willing to give up those amendments in favor of the general principle.

One word to a gentleman who announced from this platform that it was beneath the dignity of this Church to make a Canon of negations. Sir, I was brought up in one of those old-fashioned churches in which we looked on the back of the chancel at the Ten Commandments; and I would ask that gentleman whether, if he had been looking at those Ten Commandments, nine of which are prohibitions, he would have thought it beneath the dignity of this body to follow in the same track? [Applause.]

Now, sir, I speak merely as a layman, not as a giver, but as a receiver of instruction, not as a leader, but as a follower in the worship of our Church, according to the forms of the Prayer-Book; but in that capacity claim certain rights which are very dear to me as an individual, and not less dear because, though one body we are many members, and that which appertains to each member in his appropriate sphere is an integral and constituent part necessary to the completeness of the whole.

The point which I wish to make I beg leave to read from an English decision—not, let me say, because I attach in this American Church authority to English decisions, but because the principle seems to me to commend itself because of its intrinsic merit:

"In the public or common prayers and devotional offices of the Church, all her members are expected and entitled to join. It is necessary therefore that such forms of worship as are prescribed by authority for general use should embody those beliefs only which are assumed to be generally held by members of the Church."

Again:

"If the minister be allowed to introduce at his own will variations in the rites and ceremonies that seem to him to interpret the doctrine of the service in a particular direction, the service ceases to be what it was meant to be—common ground on which all church people may meet, though they differ about some doctrines."

I must add to that:

"But the Church of England has wisely left a certain latitude of opinion in matters of belief, and has not insisted on a rigorous uniformity of thought which might reduce her communion to a narrow compass."

To the establishment of this principle this Canon seems to me to address itself. I have said that I intend not to speak as a teacher. I shall assail no man's tenets; I shall not even venture to make a statement of doctrine, lest by the addition or omission of a single letter I might be thought to do injustice to some one. I ask you, according to what I have read, to stand with me upon that which is common ground; and surely if there be one thought which is transporting and consoling in connection with our membership of the Church, ah! there are many such; but that to which I ask your attention

is that there is such common ground; it is when two or three only are met together for worship, and when we are assured of a presence before which all other feelings shrink away like guilty things, save those which are included under one word, and that word is love. Now, sir, if the reader of the offices of the Church—the minister—be allowed to use forms or ceremonies which give to that worship an interpretation either of individuals or of schools, then that common ground is cut away from under our feet, and impediments are offered to the devotions of those who either do not understand or cannot enter into them.

It is the cause of the worship of the Church according to the Prayer-Book that I plead for to-day. I have said, and read from the Book before me, that a certain latitude is allowed. Certainly there is a latitude, but that latitude has its proper province, and the moment it passes beyond that province, it becomes, in the words of one of the Bishops of our Church, an abuse and a violation of right. I will illustrate by a single instance what I mean; I might by many, but time will not allow. Let us take the seventeenth Article. I read once in a Church newspaper a communication signed "A Calvinistic Episcopalian." I have a right, then, to assume that there are Calvinistic Episcopalians. To what extent they carry their Calvinism I do not ask; it does not touch the precise point; but if one of those should attempt in the service of the Church to introduce any form or ceremony which would indicate that the Prayer-Book sustains the extreme of Calvinism, I should object, and I should say that it was an invasion of my rights. I give this illustration because it came from a quarter which has not been resorted to, and therefore it cannot have any personal application.

It is, I say, the cause of the Prayer-Book that I speak for to-day; in the cause of the Prayer-Book, that always, everywhere, in all this broad land, into whatever building called by His name I may enter for worship, I may be sure of that rendering of the service which any one who is present will recognize as catholic, universal, according to the teachings of this Church.

Sir, I suppose there is no true churchman but whose heart has beat quick as visions have passed before him of the Church lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes until all in this broad land shall be counted in her fold. But believe me—and as a layman I have had some experiences which do not always lie in the path of the clergy—believe me that great consummation will not be attained except she be everywhere, as has been aptly termed, the Church of reconciliation, of the reconciliation not only of man to his Maker, but of man also to his neighbor; and unless her services are so used that their catholic, universal character is not impugned, you will make the Prayer-Book appear to hold up to the people not that great Scriptural truth, "One Lord, one faith," but rather a faith—I will not say disfigured by accretions of error, for that would be inconsistent with the spirit in which I have attempted to speak—but a faith I will only say of chameleon hues, bewildering and perplexing by scholastic definitions and metaphysical distinctions, and therefore accepted by some and rejected by others.

For these reasons I feel that it will be my duty to vote for this Canon, not because it may not be made better, but because it seems to me the only measure likely to succeed; the only measure likely to establish the principle, at least, that there is a law of the Church, and that that law must be heeded, and that that law is universal in its application.

Mr. BLANCHARD, of Maryland. Mr. President

and gentlemen of the Convention, I am rather here to apologize for the apparent presumption involved in attempting to amend or present a substitute for the work of such a Committee as your Committee on Canons, than with the idea that what I can say can change the vote or impress the mind of any one in this audience.

One thing struck me very much in my experience in this House during our eight days of protracted secret session. It was assumed by all, of whatever shade of theological opinion, that the candidate before us, sent up by the election of the Diocese of Illinois for our confirmation or rejection, could not, by any possibility, be confirmed by this House if he did hold the doctrine or practise the ceremonial proper to what is known as the doctrine of Eucharistic adoration, nor could he be confirmed if he held the doctrine and practice of what is known as auricular confession or private absolution. There was no attempt made upon the floor of this House on the part of any one, when that question was before us, to say, "Suppose he does hold the doctrine of Eucharistic adoration, it is a doctrine allowed by the Church." The effort of every gentleman who spoke in my hearing and when I was present at your deliberations was to disprove that charge, which was assumed by the House to be in the opinion of the House a disqualification for the Episcopate. And why? Because we stand here as representative men, because we are here speaking and feeling within our own hearts that there exists throughout the length and breadth of the Church an intense and deep feeling which must be expressed through the representatives of the people of the Church on this floor, in all of their action, in all of their deliberation, in all of their legislation.

I know, sir, no greater disappointment that has ever fallen upon the Church, in Maryland, the Diocese which has done me the honor to send me here as one of its Lay Deputies to speak its voice, than that which was experienced when the Convention of 1871 adjourned without acting upon these vexed questions. We all stand agreed here to-day, I believe by an enormous majority of this body, that we shall defeat the popular voice unless we legislate upon the subject.

Now, the question is, Shall that legislation be a legislation final, definite in its character with reference to something or other; or shall it stand as vague, indefinite legislation, which shall simply throw off from our own shoulders a responsibility devolved upon us by law, and to meet which responsibility the public opinion of the Church calls upon us? Shall we throw off that responsibility from our own shoulders, remit it as it was done in 1868 to the House of Bishops, and then when in 1871 the House of Bishops declined to assume our responsibility, now in 1874 remit it to the Bishop and Standing Committee of each particular Diocese? Shall we again throw away from us that which is ours to decide as the Council of the Church, or shall we meet the question and act? I claim that this Canon is so framed—I will not say intentionally—that it is no action whatever upon any given question, prohibits nothing, enjoins nothing, and simply constitutes a new tribunal not known to the Canon law of this Church, as laid down in Canon 2 of Title II., relative to the trial of offences committed by ministers. In the first place, the Title of this Canon strikes me as singular, and when the Rev. Deputy from Alabama [Rev. Dr. Fulton] had the floor, I listened to hear an explanation. Instead of being additional sections to be added to Canon 2, Title II., "Of Offences for which Ministers may be tried and punished," it is an additional section to be added to Canon 20, Title I., "Of the Use of the Book of

Common Prayer." The whole scope and purpose of it is to establish by the definition of this Canon a new offence by express language which is not included in direct terms under Canon 2 of Title II., for the trial of offences committed by a minister.

Now, to pass on to the purpose and character of the Canon, I call your attention to this passage:

"If any Bishop have reason to believe"—

I leave out that which has been criticised by Dr. De Koven, the provision about the two Presbyters.

—"that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion, not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into a parish"—

"And congregation" should certainly be in there.

—"within his jurisdiction, and, as examples, the following are considered as such"—

Not "the following are declared to be hereby prohibited." Is such a mere expression of opinion sufficient in this Canon on the subject? The propriety of this suggestion you will see when I come to examine the power of the Court to try this Presbyter.

"a. The use of incense.

"b. The placing, or carrying, or retaining a Crucifix in any part of the place of public worship.

"c. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of people as objects towards which adoration is to be made.

"d. Any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflexions, and all such like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his Council of Advice, and with them to investigate the matter."

Now, what do they examine? Not whether or not any of the acts hereinbefore specified has been committed. That is not committed to them for examination, but:

"If, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have in fact been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instrument of writing under his hand, to admonish."

So that all the specifications included here are mere waste of words, for, after all, this Council of the Church refers to the Standing Committee, together with the Bishop of each Diocese, the final decision, the final finding as to whether or not the use of incense be or be not a symbol of erroneous doctrine, and whether or not the elevation of the elements be or be not a symbol of erroneous doctrine, as to whether or not any act of adoration toward the elements in the Holy Communion be or be not a symbol of erroneous doctrine. I say, therefore, that this Canon declares nothing to be an offence whatever, but simply substitutes, in the place of an ecclesiastical court as now known, a Bishop and Standing Committee as a new court to try the questions which were discussed so ably and with so much eloquence by the Rev. Deputy from Wisconsin yesterday.

Now the scope and purport of the substitute which I have offered was to define by the action of this body, as I believe is expected of us by the Church, acts of Eucharistic adoration in sufficiently broad terms to cover all acts commonly known and used as indicating that doctrine and to prohibit them, and to put in the hands of the present ecclesiastical authority of each Diocese the power to pun-

ish them. There is the difference in principle between the two Canons.

I will now refer to the Canon proposed by me as you find it in *THE CHURCHMAN*, and I think you will see that I am correct in my statement of the theory on which it is based. Whether that be correct or not is another question.

"The following ceremonies of practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion are hereby prohibited."

Then I recite what is recited in the Canon reported by the Committee, stopping however in reciting item "d," with the words:

"Any act of adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion."

"Sec. 2. If any Bishop have reason to believe that the ceremonies or practices hereby prohibited have been introduced into any parish or congregation within his jurisdiction, it shall be his duty, as now, and without requiring the assent of the Standing Committee to enable him to do it, which is required by the Canon reported by the Committee, to admonish in writing the minister of the parish or congregation aforesaid to discontinue such ceremonies or practices; and, if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee of the Diocese to cause him to be tried before the proper ecclesiastical court of the Diocese having jurisdiction of the offences for which ministers may be tried and punished."

As now under our Canon— [Here the hammer fell.]

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Mr. President, I had not intended to say a word on this subject; certainly not when I made a motion to limit the time; but there are one or two points which I now want to make.

It seems to me that these difficulties in regard to the proposed Canon are very much like a reported interview between the Admiral of the French fleet and General Washington. When the fleet ran up into these waters during the Revolutionary War, General Washington went down towards the ship to meet the Count Rochambeau. As they came back again, and were about to go through the gates, which were very narrow, the General drew up on one side, and bowed to the Frenchman to pass on. The Frenchman bowed on the other side, and bowed very low for the General to pass in. The General said that he could not think of passing in before the representative of His Majesty's forces in America. The Count, on the other side, replied that it is utterly out of the question that the delegate of the French King should pass in before the General-in-Chief of the armies of America. If they had been the General Convention, they would have been standing there still. [Laughter.] But, fortunately for them, old Morgan, I think it was, the old Kentucky hunter, with his rough hunting-shirt, was standing wondering at them, as I have been wondering at these refined distinctions and amendments to the Canon of the Committee, and finally, putting both hands in his pockets, he marched through, and left them to follow in what way they could. [Laughter.]

Years ago we started in this matter. Years ago we did what a gentleman whom I recognize now with great pleasure, and thank God that he is here, although I differ from him in what he wishes to do, told you to do. We were brought up and shipwrecked on the Canons of 1603-4, in Baltimore—completely shipwrecked upon a mere question that is so far in the abstract that I doubt whether one man in fifty has made up his mind about it yet. We were asked to assert the principle that the Canons of 1603-4 were binding on this Church, or else we could not get at Ritual, and so we were obliged to assert a falsehood in passing

the Canons, for I do not believe they are binding, in order to get a competent condemnation of Ritual.

Now, gentlemen, in all cases of this kind the question is whether you pass a Canon that means something or not. That is the point. The Canon may be imperfect. The Canon must meet all the points. The Canon may be capable of the perversion of my eloquent friends, and yet the Canon may exactly meet the point; and outside of this Church it is recognized as meeting the point. Outside of this building it is perfectly well understood what the Canon means. It means either the downfall or the victory of Ritualism.

I was given a letter by my good friend from Virginia on Sunday night, and, if I had the time, I would like to read it. I know the eloquence, I know the earnestness of the gentleman. I do not know the writer; I do not know but that he is some man full of fire, full of right spirit; but the point that he makes is that this Convention, by a foregone conclusion, intends to condemn the Ritualists, whatever Canon be passed, no matter what they do, and if they do it, what then? "We will all go back; we will be Old Catholics; we will go where these things are all practised," and his words have the ring in them of rebellion, and men stand here taking aim; it may not be constitutional, it is well to be cautious about it; it may not exactly meet this; it may put two Presbyters in a somewhat uncomfortable position to do that, and we had better wait a little while; do not be quite so rapid about it. Gentlemen, fire! [Laughter.]

A member of the C. B. S. called on me who had been a former assistant. I believe he was one of their honorable secretaries. A very large symbol or flag hung before him. He began to attempt to prove that he and I were alike; that he as a member of the C. B. S. and I were standing in about the same position. I said to him, "I will give you my position. You go and tell any member of the C. B. S. who wants to know it that any man who bows toward the Altar, who worships any presence of Christ in, under, upon, above, below, before, behind, or in any way contingent on the presence of Christ there, in my judgment—and God forgive me if I say a word now to hurt any man's feelings—is in the Church what Benedict Arnold was in the State, and any man of the sixty denominations of Protestants, on the broadest plank of them, is nearer to me in my judgment and my opinions as a churchman than that man."

The Canon of 1640 does not bind this Church any more than the Canons of 1603, but it does interpret the language of Laud and Andrewes, and all of that school, as well as any language has been capable of interpreting them, and declares that any bowing in the church toward the altar, toward the Communion table, toward any part of the church, or any act of adoration in the church except as to the presence of Almighty God, is forbidden in the Church of England; and I maintain that the plain, candid, practical meaning of that black Rubric, as it was written by Cranmer, and as it lay upon the page of the Prayer-Book undisturbed until 1661—that it was then taken as the expression of the Church of England by Cranmer, I know.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. No, sir.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I beg your pardon. That has denied to us all the radical principles that are the evil of the system of Ritualism.

The other proposition is that the Bishop in some way or other is to proceed. How? He cannot take hearsay. He cannot listen to this one and that one coming to him. The idea is that there shall be complaint by two responsible men before the subject is investigated. Is not that a perfectly fair and sound principle? Is it not well that there should be proper endorsers for a statement of that kind? Shall

clergymen be brought up for investigation without a proper endorsement of those whose responsibility is such that it can be brought to bear directly upon them?

Now, sir, I must talk in a hurry, and therefore I am only trying to leap as it were at the point. I hold it to be a simple matter of ordinary common sense that this Convention must meet this question. Six years the Church has been waiting. Once we had a Committee between times, and were stranded and shipwrecked. Now we have had a proposition brought in by the Committee on Canons composed of some of the best men and best-informed minds in the Church, those who know what is Constitution and law. It seems to me that the most certain way to defeat the Canon is to amend it. The most certain way to defeat it and to destroy the whole is to confuse this assembly by a variety of movements, bringing in one amendment after another, confusing one with another, so many men with that and so many men with this, and you at last do nothing and go back again to your constituents to have them ask you what has been done. Gentlemen, we are in a world that is moving on, and we are in a world that demands of the Episcopal Church some like action. God has placed us here to reach the wave of popular will, and it may be that God has placed us here to control the world, to bring it into subjection to the Gospel, and it is the fair right of the American mind to ask of the Episcopal Church to let them know what is her clear and undoubted teaching on this matter.

I hold that this is a logical sequence of what has been done. I voted that the reverend gentleman, who was elected by that Diocese, should be made Bishop of Illinois. If we now go home defeated, if the point that is brought up here is not completed, it seems to me that we must feel that we have done an injustice. I have for that man that affection and confidence that I believe it would be the hardest thing for me to face the fact that the Convention, after saying to him, and in saying as they did in saying to the American world, and by that I mean at large, the Church elsewhere, that no man shall be Bishop in this Church unless he is perfectly above all question on these matters, now hesitate to unfurl the flag and let men see what it is you condemn. Yea, I would that God would send down His Holy Spirit on this Convention, and after we have passed a Canon on Ritual that might hereafter remedy these difficulties, I would to God it might be in our power and might be in our hearts then to turn and take up again those papers, and send them back to Illinois, and, after all we have done, to allow there may be a Christian, a solemn, and a most sacred mode of reconsideration.

I am of no party. I know nothing at all of any party connected with these matters; but it seems to me it would be acting with a course that would have the blessing of God upon it if, after passing the Canon, if after allaying the doubts, if after settling the difficulties that have beset us thus far, we could then turn, and instead of meeting a brother with what would be to me a broken heart, instead of leaving a man to go and hereafter know that the brand of the Church had been put upon him, to take him again and send back to those men who elected him the opportunity of reviewing the case, that those terrible doubts, that those fearful letters that came in—

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is arraigning this conviction.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I beg pardon for any such implication.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania, rose.

The PRESIDENT. You have but five minutes.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Three minutes will be enough. I wish simply to ask a question of the Committee on Canons, and one member of that Committee, I think, will understand the reason. It is to guide me in my vote, that I may know whether I shall not more effectively reach the object proposed by voting for the amendment proposed by Dr. De Koven or that of Mr. Blanchard. In conversation with a member of that Committee, I raised the point that there was in that amendment a more distinct statement and prohibition of certain doctrines and acts, and I understood him to tell me that the Committee on Canons had purposely so planned their Canon that it did not deny the doctrines here mentioned as being forbidden or as being erroneous and doubtful doctrines, that it meant to leave that as an open point. Now if it be the intention of the Committee on Canons so to frame this Canon that it will leave that point doubtful, the members of this Convention should understand it, and vote for the clear, definite, positive language of the amendment proposed. I wish their answer when they speak.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Mr. President, it is with great diffidence and distrust of myself that at the direction of the Committee on Canons I now proceed to close this debate. Certainly the more when I have only fifteen minutes in which to reply to all the attacks on the one side and on the other with which this Canon has been assailed. I do not propose to discuss the question within this limited time theologically or even practically, but my purpose is simply to bring the attention of the Convention to the Canon itself, and to explain, to the best of my ability, what is the scope and what will be the effect of that Canon, provided it meet the approval of the two Houses of this Convention. I think that, to a great extent, this has been lost sight of. We have had a great many most brilliant speeches upon the subject of Ritualism, both setting forth its dangers and its advantages, to none of which, either on the one side or the other, will I now address myself; but I will simply take up the Canon which the Committee have reported to you, and I shall endeavor, by explaining what it does mean, in that way to reply to the objections which have been made to it. I shall deem that to be the best method of answering them.

In the first place, therefore, I ask you to read this Canon with the parts in parentheses left out. That will show you what the Canon provides, and I think it will explain away a great many of the difficulties which have been suggested, because its scope has certainly been misconceived by many gentlemen who have addressed you, and it will at least show you what the Committee, as the result of their deliberation, have presented to this House. We all know that where a matter is placed in parentheses, it may be omitted without disturbing the context of what goes before and what follows.

Therefore, without attempting to read it, I will simply state that this Canon provides substantially that if any practices or ceremonies which set forth or symbolize erroneous or doubtful doctrine have been introduced into any parish, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, either upon his own motion or upon the complaint of two Presbyters, to institute an investigation. That is the first thing to be done. There is no offence defined there; there is nothing prohibited there. We may, I think, assume that any minister who does teach erroneous doctrine has violated the law of the Church. We simply provide a method of investigating whether he has set forth or sym-

bolized false doctrines in a certain way. If, upon this investigation, it be found that in point of fact such doctrines have been taught or symbolized, then it becomes the duty of the Bishop to admonish him to discontinue such practices and acts.

So far, there is no definition of an offence; there is no forbidding of the doing or the not doing of any particular act; but now comes, and for the first time, the offence at which this Canon is aimed, and that is the refusal of the Presbyter whose acts have been decided by the Bishop, acting by and with the advice of the Standing Committee, to set forth or symbolize erroneous or doubtful doctrines. When he refuses to obey the admonition of his Bishop, then is committed the offence for which he is to be tried, and then only.

That, gentlemen, is the full scope and effect of this Canon. It does not forbid in terms certain practices to be introduced, because there were members on that Committee who would not have consented to introduce into this House any Canon which ventured to interfere with the Ritual of the Church, either by commanding or prohibiting, believing that that was a matter which was sacred to the Rubrics, and that we by Canon had no right to interfere with those Rubrics, either by positive or by negative legislation; but we did have the right to forbid a minister to do or not to do certain acts which, in the opinion of his Bishop, did symbolize or set forth erroneous or doubtful doctrine, and that for the peace and good order of the Church.

With that explanation I ask you to interpret what has been put in by way of parenthesis. It was said that this general method of dealing with this subject, this simply forbidding acts which, in the opinion of the Bishop, set forth or symbolized false or erroneous doctrine, was not sufficient, but that it was needful, in order to clear all doubts as to what we meant, that some, at least, of these acts which were before us should be specified, and you will notice the cautious language with which these specifications are introduced. We do not say that they are forbidden. We do not say absolutely that they are unlawful. We do not by law declare them to be such; but we simply say that in the opinion of the Committee, as individuals or as a Committee, and that in the opinion of this House and the House of Bishops, if the Canon be approved, these particular acts are symbolical of doubtful or erroneous doctrine. It does not foreclose the case. It has not the effect even of a declaratory law; it simply expresses the deliberate opinion and conviction of this Convention that such and such acts, among others, do symbolize or set forth erroneous or doubtful doctrines, leaving it to be decided hereafter in the proper way whether they do or do not, but giving the weight of the opinion of this Convention to the affirmative side of the question.

Now, Mr. President and gentlemen, I ask your attention to the word "doubtful," which has been the source of much criticism; and I will tell you why that word was chosen by the Committee. It was for this reason: When a Bishop and a Standing Committee have decided that the clergyman whose practices are under consideration has by acts set forth or symbolized certain doctrines, his acts should not be thereby stamped as having taught erroneous doctrine; it might leave it charitably to be supposed that the Bishop and Standing Committee had only considered that the doctrine was a doubtful one; and as such, with a view of securing the peace of the Church, they had a right to forbid it. This Canon gives the Bishop, with the advice of the Standing Committee, the right to forbid a practice which, in their opinion, sets forth a doubtful doctrine.

And here I call your attention to a matter which

has not yet even been alluded to; there is a proviso to this Canon which has not been called to your attention, and it is an important matter. You will observe that the proviso to Subsection 2 is "that nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest." The provision which we propose by this Canon runs side by side with Canon 2, which you may all turn to, and which sets forth offences for which a minister may be tried. Among others is that of the teaching of false doctrines. There is nothing in this Canon which will prohibit the question from being raised under the mode of trial which may be prescribed in the Dioceses for violating that Canon in any of the particulars. The object of this is simply to provide another method not only of reaching the teaching of false and erroneous doctrine, but of preventing the setting forth or symbolizing of doubtful doctrine, and that, as I said before, for the peace of the Church.

There has been an objection made by the gentleman from Maryland [Rev. Dr. Lewin] that we encroached upon that portion of the Constitution which prescribed that the mode of trying ministers shall be or may be prescribed by the Dioceses. I do not know whether it is necessary to go into these particulars, but that matter was before the Committee, and we were all unanimously of the opinion that it did not affect or touch that question, because the trial under this Canon will only come on after the minister has committed the offence, and it can only come on after the action of the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee and the Bishop have not tried him; they have not decided that any offence has been committed for which he may be disciplined. But after he has committed the offence of which I have spoken, which simply is the refusal to obey the admonition of his Bishop, the Standing Committee will then simply provide that he be tried under the provision of the Diocese for that offence. They have not yet tried him, nor do they, under the provisions of this Canon, proceed to try him; but this Canon makes it their duty to see that he is tried under the provisions which the Constitution and Canons of his own Diocese may have provided to meet the case.

Inasmuch as the remarks which I have to make are limited, I do not know that it will be necessary for me to go any further than I have gone. The Committee on Canons desire, of course, that this Canon shall be passed just as it is. They think if any amendments be adopted by the House it will endanger the success of the entire measure. They leave that, of course, to the wisdom of the House. They only say that this Canon in the shape that it now is presented is the only one which, after careful and prayerful discussion, they were able to unite upon. Whether this House will proceed to adopt different amendments to it, will make the Canon better than it is, or will defeat it, is a question which will be submitted to the wisdom of the House. We do think, however, that if amendments shall be adopted, the whole Canon will be endangered. And, therefore, with a view of testing the feeling of the House upon that question, as to whether the Canon shall go through without amendment, or whether the House will throw it open to any amendments which may be brought forward, I am instructed by the Committee to move, as I now do, that all the amendments which have been offered, and all the substitutes, be laid on the table.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I would like to suggest an amendment, for the purpose of perfecting the Canon. It will be observed that in this Canon there is no provision made for declaring the minister of

the parish to have introduced the objectionable practice or to have given it his sanction. Now, our experience as rectors of parishes is that our people go ahead of us very far in the matter of Ritual, and that there are a great many who would come under the condemnation of the part marked *d* in the proposed Canon when the clergyman himself is wholly guiltless. ["Order, Order."]

The PRESIDENT. The House is unwilling to hear the Deputy.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I wish simply to present the matter to the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to lay the amendments and the substitute on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move the adoption of the Canon.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I now move an amendment, of which I gave notice.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move to lay it on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I desire to have it read.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I rise to a question of order.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. It cannot be read. The hour has arrived for taking the vote, and that is the only business of this House at this time. It was read by the gentleman himself in his speech.

The PRESIDENT. It was not then before the House. I presume the gentleman has a right to have it read. He has a minute left before the time for voting.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I offer it as an amendment, and as an amendment I have a right to have it read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. I rise to a question of order. That amendment was pending before the House and was laid, by vote of the House, on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. Then I raise another question of order: that this House determined to vote at four o'clock, and nothing else can now be entertained. The time has arrived for voting.

The PRESIDENT. The hour had not arrived when this amendment was offered.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. But it has arrived now, and the House cannot entertain anything, but must vote. I make that distinct point of order, and ask the ruling of the Chair upon it.

The PRESIDENT. I overrule the point of order. The thing will be laid on the table in one minute after the Secretary finishes it.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The Deputy from Pittsburgh moves to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question is now on the resolution of the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee. Tennessee calls for a vote by orders.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I hope that call will be withdrawn. I think the House will carry it by acclamation. It will be much more impressive.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. It is much more impressive to vote by orders.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Kentucky asks for a vote by orders.

The PRESIDENT. That has already been asked for by the Diocese of Tennessee.

The Secretary called the roll, with the following result:

CLERICAL VOTE.

Alabama.—Rev. Dr. Banister, Rev. Dr. Stringfellow, Rev. Dr. Fulton, and Rev. Mr. Cobbs, aye.

Albany.—Rev. Dr. Payne, Rev. Dr. Tucker, Rev. Dr. Beers, and Rev. Dr. Brown, nay.

Arkansas.—Rev. Mr. Trimble and Rev. Mr. Bruce, aye.

California.—Rev. Mr. Birdsall, Rev. Mr. Easton, and Rev. Mr. Githens, aye. Rev. Mr. Chetwood, nay.

Central New York.—Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, Rev. Dr. Wilson, Rev. Dr. Ayrault, and Rev. Mr. Hitchcock, aye.

Central Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Paret, Rev. Dr. Breck, Rev. Mr. Marple, and Rev. Mr. Leverett, aye.

Connecticut.—Rev. Dr. Mead, Rev. Dr. Beardsley, Rev. Mr. Johnson, and Rev. Dr. Clark, aye.

Delaware.—Rev. Mr. Spencer, Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss, Rev. Mr. Stone, and Rev. Mr. Douglass, aye.

Easton.—Rev. Mr. Barber, Rev. Dr. Crosdale, and Rev. Dr. Fulton, aye. Rev. Dr. Stearns, nay.

Florida.—Rev. Mr. Thackara, Rev. Dr. Scott, and Rev. Mr. Mumford, aye.

Georgia.—Rev. Mr. Rees, Rev. Mr. Clarke, Rev. Dr. Williams, Rev. Dr. Benedict, aye.

Illinois.—Rev. Dr. Chase, Rev. Dr. Corbett, and Rev. Dr. Sullivan, aye. Rev. Mr. Knowles, nay.

Indiana.—Rev. Dr. Wakefield, aye. Rev. Mr. Dunham, nay.

Iowa.—Rev. Mr. Mollwain, Rev. Mr. Trimble, Rev. Mr. Goodhue, aye.

Kansas.—Rev. Dr. Reynolds, Rev. Mr. Bakewell, Rev. Mr. Dunn, and Rev. Mr. Beatty, aye.

Kentucky.—Rev. Dr. Craik, Rev. Dr. Perkins, Rev. Mr. Shipman, and Rev. Mr. Pettis, aye.

Long Island.—Rev. Dr. Hall, Rev. Dr. Schenck, Rev. Dr. Diller, and Rev. Dr. Haskins, aye.

Louisiana.—Rev. Mr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Girault, and Rev. Dr. Dalzell, aye. Rev. Mr. Harris, nay.

Maine.—Rev. Mr. Leffingwell, Rev. Mr. Upjohn, Rev. Mr. Ward, and Rev. Dr. Pise, aye.

Maryland.—Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. Dr. Lewin, Rev. Dr. Leeds, and Rev. Dr. Dudley, aye.

Massachusetts.—Rev. Dr. Vinton, Rev. Dr. Huntington, Rev. Dr. Burgess, and Rev. Dr. Lambert, aye.

Michigan.—Rev. Mr. Gillespie, aye. Rev. Mr. Brown and Rev. Mr. Worthington, nay.

Minnesota.—Rev. Dr. McMasters, Rev. Dr. Kidney, and Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker, aye.

Mississippi.—Rev. Dr. Sansom, Rev. Mr. Douglas, and Rev. Mr. Marks, aye.

Missouri.—Rev. Dr. Runcie and Rev. Mr. Jennings, aye.

Nebraska.—Rev. Dr. Garrett, Rev. Mr. Shaw, and Rev. Mr. Goodale, aye.

New Hampshire.—Rev. Dr. Hubbard, Rev. Dr. Herrick, and Rev. Mr. Houghton, aye.

New Jersey.—Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, Rev. Dr. Clark, and Rev. Mr. Garrison, aye; Rev. Dr. Farrington, nay.

New York.—Rev. Dr. Cooke, Rev. Dr. Beach, and Rev. Dr. Geer, aye. Rev. Dr. Cady, nay.

North Carolina.—Rev. Dr. Watson, Rev. Dr. Smedes, Rev. Dr. Buxton, and Rev. Mr. Huske, aye.

Ohio.—Rev. Dr. Burr, Rev. Dr. Boyd, Rev. Mr. Jewett, and Rev. Mr. Farr, aye.

Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Rudder, Rev. Mr. Bolton, Rev. Dr. Davies, aye.

Pittsburgh.—Rev. Dr. Scarborough, Rev. Mr. Getz, and Rev. Mr. Smith, aye; Rev. Dr. Spalding, nay.

Rhode Island.—Rev. Mr. Henshaw, Rev. Mr. Seymour, Rev. Mr. Goodwin, and Rev. Mr. Locke, aye.

South Carolina.—Rev. Mr. Pinckney, Rev. Dr.

Elliott, Rev. Mr. Porter, and Rev. Mr. McCollough, aye.

Tennessee.—Rev. Mr. Gray, Rev. Dr. Harrison, Rev. Dr. Beckett, and Rev. Dr. Humes, aye.

Texas.—Rev. Mr. Rogers, Rev. Mr. Bird, Rev. Mr. Richardson, and Rev. Mr. Davenport, aye.

Vermont.—Rev. Dr. Douglass, Rev. Mr. Bliss, and Rev. Mr. Atwill, aye. Rev. Mr. Putnam, nay.

Virginia.—Rev. Dr. Andrews, Rev. Dr. Norton, Rev. Mr. Hanckel, and Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, aye.

Western New York.—Rev. Dr. Shelton, Rev. Dr. Foote, Rev. Dr. Rankine, and Rev. Mr. Mann, aye.

Wisconsin.—Rev. Dr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Haff, and Rev. Mr. Ten Broeck, aye. Rev. Dr. De Koven, nay.

LAY VOTE.

Alabama.—Messrs. Dawson and Bray, aye.

Albany.—Messrs. Meads, Forsyth, and Keese, nay.

California.—Messrs. Webb and Walsh, aye.

Central New York.—Messrs. Chedell, McWhorter, Comstock, and Clarke, aye.

Central Pennsylvania.—Messrs. Coppée, Lamber-ton, and Rockwell, aye.

Connecticut.—Messrs. Stark, Robertson, and Hayden, aye.

Delaware.—Messrs. Fell and Curtis, aye.

Easton.—Messrs. Mackall, Walker, and Goldsborough, aye.

Florida.—Mr. Daniel, aye.

Georgia.—Messrs. Jenkins, Whittle, and Montgomery, aye.

Illinois.—Messrs. Otis and Whitehouse, aye.

Indiana.—Mr. Morrison, aye.

Iowa.—Messrs. Bever and Daymude, aye.

Kansas.—Messrs. Farnsworth, Bartholow, and Todd, aye.

Kentucky.—Messrs. Stevenson, Cornwall, Church-ill, and Bullock, aye.

Long Island.—Messrs. Pierrepont, Hunter, and King, aye.

Louisiana.—Messrs. Race and Biscoe, aye.

Maine.—Messrs. Bridge and Jackson, aye.

Maryland.—Messrs. Brune, Blanchard, and Blair, aye.

Massachusetts.—Messrs. Mudge and Mason, aye.

Mr. Shattuck, nay.

Michigan.—Messrs. Trowbridge and Baldwin, aye.

Minnesota.—Messrs. Wilder, Atwater, and Keese, aye.

Mississippi.—Mr. Pegues, aye.

Missouri.—Messrs. Bodley, Douglass, and Simp-son, aye.

New Hampshire.—Messrs. Farwell and Low, aye.

New Jersey.—Mr. Meigs, aye. Mr. Garthwaite, nay.

New York.—Mr. Ruggles, aye. Messrs. Livingston and Davies, nay.

North Carolina.—Messrs. Battle, De Rossett, and Smith, aye. Mr. Martin, nay.

Ohio.—Messrs. Andrews, Moss, Horton, and Dev-ereaux, aye.

Pennsylvania.—Messrs. Harrison, Welsh, Coffin, and Hazlehurst, aye.

Pittsburgh.—Messrs. Shoenberger, Burgwin, and Howe, aye. Mr. Cass, nay.

Rhode Island.—Messrs. Richmond, Hoppin, and King, aye.

South Carolina.—Messrs. McCrady, Lesesne, and Smith, aye.

Tennessee.—Messrs. Thompson, Stephens, Cooper, and Fairbanks, aye.

Texas.—Messrs. Augur and Jackson, aye.

Vermont.—Mr. Canfield, nay.

Virginia.—Messrs. Sheffey, Parker, Massie, and Taylor, aye.

Western New York.—Messrs. Parshall, Smith, Cuyler, and Montgomery, aye.

Wisconsin.—Mr. Clark, aye.

RECAPITULATION.

Clergy.—Dioceses voting, 41. Aye, 38; nay, 2; divided, 1.

Laity.—Dioceses voting, 39. Aye, 35; nay, 3; divided, 1.

So it was

"Resolved (The House of Bishops concurring), that the following additional section be added to Canon 20, Title I, 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer':

"Sec. 2. [1] If any Bishop have reason to believe or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters, that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion, not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or sym-bolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction (and, as examples, the following are declared to be considered as such:

"a. The use of incense.

"b. The placing, or carrying, or retaining a cruci-fix in any part of the place of public worship.

"c. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of people as objects towards which adoration is to be made.

"d. Any act of or adoration of or towards the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflections, and all such like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer), it shall be the duty of such Bi-shop to summon the Standing Committee as his Council of Advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2.] If, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have in fact been set forth or symbolized by ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instrument of writing, under his hand, to admonish the Minister of the Parish to disconti-nue such practices or ceremonies; and if the Minis-ter shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent the pre-sentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3.] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon, the minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be no-tified, and have opportunity to be heard in his defence. The charges preferred and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceed-ings in the case."

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I move that the House adjourn.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. If there is a general understanding that I can get up the Hymnal in the morning, I will say aye.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

PRESIDING BISHOP.

A message (No. 51) from the House of Bishops an-nounced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in Message No. 34 from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, asking for a Joint Committee with reference to some plan of relief for the Presiding Bishop;

"And that this House has appointed as members of such Committee the Bishop of Ohio, the Bishop of Indiana, and the Bishop of Pennsylvania."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House adjourned until to-morrow morning at nine o'clock.

NINETEENTH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, October 28.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. John M. Banister, D.D., of Alabama. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Robert W. Trimble, of Arkansas, who also pronounced the Benediction.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported that leave of absence for the remainder of the session had been granted to Mr. R. C. Mackall, of the Diocese of Easton, Mr. Richard H. Smith, of the Diocese of North Carolina, and Mr. Frederick W. Brune, of the Diocese of Maryland.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. We have referred all applications for leave of absence to this Committee with power to act. I move, therefore, that whenever they make a report hereafter they inform the Convention whether the leaves that they have granted will leave the delegation to which the Deputy belongs without representation. It is an important fact for us to know.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. The Committee on Elections do not consider themselves at liberty to grant a leave of absence that would leave a Diocese without representation.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I have the report of the Committee on the General Theological Seminary, as amended by the Committee. I would like to ask whether I shall read the whole report or simply the paragraph which has been changed by the Committee since the recommitment?

The PRESIDENT. If it has been read once, it need not be read again.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I will read, then, the paragraph which has been changed. It is as follows:

"The Committee further report that they have prepared the accompanying list of Clerical and Lay Trustees, which, after being passed upon by this House, is to be sent to the House of Bishops for its approval. This list has been compiled from the certificates forwarded to this House, as required by Canon 4 of Title III., and containing the nomination by the Diocese of a trustee or trustees, and without which certificate the Canon expressly provides that the nomination shall not be confirmed. The Dioceses from which the canonical certificates were received are the following:"

Then follow the names—thirty-one in all. I present the report thus amended, and move the adoption of the resolution appended to the report.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I should like to hear it read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Trustees named in the accompanying list be confirmed as members of the Board of the General Theological Seminary for the next three years."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is the resolution before us?

The PRESIDENT. If the matter is to be argued or objected to, it will have to go on the Calendar.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I hope it will go on the Calendar, as I have very serious objections to make to it.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Mr. GETZ, of Pittsburgh. I desire to offer the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Committee be appointed to arrange a time for the final adjournment of this Convention."

And, if it be in order, I would suggest that this Joint Committee be, on the part of this House, the Joint Committee for fixing the place of the meeting of the next Convention, to save the necessity of appointing another committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman who moved the resolution suggested that the Committee on the part of this House be the same Committee that was appointed to consider the place for the next meeting of the Convention. The Chair hears no objection to that suggestion; and that Committee will accordingly act.

SYNODS OF DIOCESES.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I should like to ask of the House the suspension of the sixteenth rule of order in order to enable me to introduce a resolution. A few moments will enable me to say what the subject-matter is. The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a Canon, entitled "Of the Formation of Synods of Dioceses," have reported, asking to be discharged on the ground that they have not time, at this late hour of the session, to enter into the consideration of the subject-matter. Had we more time, it is possible that this Canon might have been brought up for discussion; but as this is not likely to be the case now, I desire to move for the appointment of a joint commission, in order that the matter may be taken under consideration during the recess.

This, indeed, is a measure of relief simply to those Dioceses that have divided or are about to be divided. They realize the importance of it. Perhaps, other Dioceses do not. I therefore ask a suspension of the rules in order to move for the appointment of a Joint Commission, to consist of three Bishops, three clergymen, and laymen, to report to the next Convention on this subject. If this permission is granted, I will introduce my resolution in due form.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is it only to provide for Dioceses that we have divided? If that is all, we have a Canon already for the confederation of Dioceses in the same State.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. That has been found inadequate. It does not meet the want of other Dioceses. I will read the resolution which I hope to be allowed to offer, and it will explain itself:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a joint commission, to consist of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen, be appointed to report to the next General Convention a Canon, or a constitutional amendment, or whatever legislation may be necessary, to authorize the formation of Synods of Dioceses, or some kind of ecclesiastical union of Dioceses, within the same State or Commonwealth."

I do not wish to discuss the matter at all. It is, as I said, a measure of relief for the Dioceses which have divided or propose to divide. At any rate, the matter can be carefully thought over by such a commission. I now ask the permission of the House to suspend the rules in order that I may introduce the resolution.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I hope the permission will be granted.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to suspend the sixteenth rule so as to allow the introduction of the resolution which has been read.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I now offer the resolution.

The resolution was read by the Secretary.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. A joint federate council at present exists in several States, I think. We, in the State of New York, I know, have a federate council. I do not see the necessity of this.

The PRESIDENT. The matter goes on the Calendar, giving rise to discussion.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The House of Bishops sent down a message (No. 50) yesterday, non-concurring in the Canon for the organization of the House, which this House adopted a few days ago. I am informed credibly that they acted under some misapprehension with regard to the effect of that Canon, and that it can be easily adjusted if a Committee of Conference be appointed. I therefore now move that we insist on our action in that matter, and request the appointment of a Committee of Conference with the House of Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. Instead of the Committee on Canons, which is too large, the Chair appoints the Subcommittee that had the matter under consideration, viz.: Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia; Mr. Burgwin, of Pittsburgh, and Mr. Otis, of Illinois.

ABANDONMENT OF COMMUNION.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, submitted the following report, which was placed on the Calendar:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 29, from the House of Bishops, proposing an amended Canon of the Abandonment of the Communion of the Church by a Bishop, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the House concur in the proposed Canon with amendments, as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in their proposed amendment to Canon 8, Title II., with the following amendments:

"1. Insert after the word 'Church,' in the fourth line of the amended Canon, these words, 'either by an open renunciation of the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the Church, or by a formal admission into any religious body not in Communion with the same, or otherwise.'

"2. In the thirteenth line of the same, strike out 'shall' and insert 'may.'

"3. Insert after the word 'deposition,' at the end of the first clause of said amended Canon, these words, 'And in case the Bishop so abandoning the Communion of the Church be the Presiding Elder, the Bishop next in order of seniority shall be deemed to be, and shall act as, the Presiding Bishop under this Canon.'

"4. After the word 'false,' in the second clause, insert these words, 'and shall demand a trial.'

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, submitted the following report, which was placed on the Calendar:

"The Committee on Canons have had under consideration Message No. 39 of the House of Bishops, proposing an amendment of Section 1, Canon 6, Title II., 'Of the Abandonment of the Communion of this Church by a Presbyter or Deacon,' and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House of Deputies concur with the House of Bishops in the proposed amendment of Section 1, Canon 6, Title II., with the following amendment:

"Strike out the word 'and' after the word discipline in the fifth line, and insert the word 'or.'"

ORDER OF DEACONESES.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, submitted the following report, which was placed on the Calendar:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the Canon reported by the Joint Committee appointed at the last General Convention, respectfully report that they are unable to recommend the passage of said Canon as it has come to them, for the reason that it is not sufficiently explicit as to what is to be understood by the word 'Deaconess.' Throughout the proposed Canon the word *Sister* is used as synonymous with 'Deaconess'; although, as it appears to this Committee there is a marked difference between the Order of Deaconesses, as described by early Christian writers, and the Associations of Christian women now existing under the name of Sisterhoods. While we fully appreciate the value and usefulness of the service rendered by these Sisterhoods, we are not prepared to make them identical with an order of Ministers which undoubtedly existed in the Primitive Church, but regarding whose official position therein we have so little certain knowledge. The Committee therefore do not deem it expedient to legislate at present upon the subject of the Order of Deaconesses; and they prefer to leave the subject of the Sisterhoods to such action as each Diocese may judge wise and proper for itself.

"They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed 'Canon of Deaconesses or Sisters.'"

EUCCHARISTIC ADORATION.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I beg the favor of the House to offer a substitute for the resolution, now No. 1 on the Calendar, offered by me, and that this substitute go on the Calendar instead of that:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following are hereby solemnly declared to be foreign to this Church, to wit:

"1. Such rites, ceremonies, and usages of Eucharistic Adoration as proceed from the belief that our Lord is present upon the Holy Table, as the appointed place of His presence, in and under the forms of the bread and wine, by virtue of the consecration of the elements, and is there to be worshipped, and that He is offered by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

"2. All teachings leading to the rites, ceremonies, and usages aforesaid."

I offer this as a substitute for my resolution, now No. 1 on the Calendar, and I ask that it be placed on the Calendar instead of that.

The PRESIDENT. I do not think you can do that. You can offer that as an amendment when the resolution comes up on the Calendar in its order.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. Will it be in order to ask to withdraw the original resolution?

The PRESIDENT. I do not think it is in order to do anything with a matter on the Calendar until it comes up.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. I think all these amendments and substitutes were laid on the table before we voted on the Canon reported by the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. There is nothing now before the House.

FUNERAL SERVICES.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Feeling the difficulty myself, and in the interest of others and by their request, I should like the consent of the House to the introduction of this resolution.

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops be respectfully requested to inform this House what course

can in their judgment be lawfully and properly taken by a minister of this Church when called upon to officiate at the funeral of a person who has died under circumstances in which the order for the burial of the dead is prohibited to be used."

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read by the Secretary.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I understood the other day that the point was taken and sustained, that until consent was given to suspend the rules it was not allowed to bring a resolution even before the House by reading.

The PRESIDENT. I do not recollect that that point was sustained. The resolution is merely read to know for what purpose leave is asked.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I make the point now, and ask a decision that, until consent is given to bring a matter before the House, it is not permissible even to read the document.

The PRESIDENT. I decide against the point of order.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. How can the House know what the resolution is until it is read?

The resolution was read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that Rule No. 16 be suspended in order to allow the introduction of the resolution just read.

The motion was not agreed to, two-thirds not voting therefor.

CANON ON RITUAL.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I rise, Mr. President, not to make a motion, but, if it be in order, to make a request that I may be allowed to record my vote in favor of the Canon determined yesterday. In support of that Canon as a temporary expedient important in itself, I was allowed to address the House at an early moment because unavoidable duty called me from the city; and as I was necessarily absent yesterday, I should esteem it a privilege to put myself on the record as voting in the affirmative.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move that the permission be granted.

The PRESIDENT. If there be no objection the Secretary will take it for granted that leave is given, and Dr. Leeds or any other gentleman can record his name on the passage of the Ritual Canon voted on yesterday.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I submit the following report:

"The Joint Committee, to whom was referred the subject of making proper provision for the present senior and Presiding Bishop, beg leave to report that they have duly considered the matter committed to them, and would respectfully submit that they propose meeting the exigency in part by, unofficial action, which it is not necessary to report to this House, and in part by the proposition which is hereby presented in the form of the following resolution, viz.:

"Resolved"—

I have put it here (the House of Bishops concurring), as a matter of courtesy, because it is a Joint Committee, although it is mainly for the consideration of this House.

—"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Committee on Expenses be instructed to report an appropriation of \$500 per annum, in addition to the amount usually appropriated, for the expenses incurred by the present Senior Bishop in the discharge of the duties devolving upon him."

I only say, Mr. President, that this is a very delicate subject. The matter has been laid before the Committee, and they are unanimous in their action, and have instructed me very warmly to present this

report to the House and ask the immediate adoption of the resolution. The unofficial method that is proposed conjointly with this, I need not here explain. It will be brought privately to the attention of the lay members of the House in the course of the next twenty-four hours. A gentleman in this city has kindly consented to take charge of that part of the effort; and we only now ask the House to vote, in view of the great age and infirmities and other necessities, to which I trust I may not be called upon to advert, to make this appropriation of \$500, in addition to the amount usually appropriated.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Is it proposed to refer the resolution to the Committee on Expenses?

The PRESIDENT. No; it is an instruction to the Committee. It is not referred to their discretion.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. That matter came before the Committee on Expenses, whether we could properly give a larger allowance than we did give, and we decided that it was not proper to do it. If anything is to be done in the way of evincing good feeling or charity, it is another thing; but it is not well for this House to give more for the value of any service than what was agreed on, considering that it forms a precedent. We do not think it right for the House to enter into any consideration which is a matter of charity or something of that kind. We thought the services of the Presiding Bishop were amply paid by the allowance which was made.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I ask that the resolution go on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

ENGLISH CHURCH CONGRESS.

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. I rise rather to a question of privilege. I hold in my hand a communication addressed to a Presbyter of this Church, the Rev. Dr. Lamson, by the venerable Archdeacon and Canon of Ely, Perpetual Secretary of the English Church Congress. Dr. Lamson desires that this communication should be read to the House, and also that I should present to the House a volume which the Archdeacon desires we should receive, as an expression of the kindly feelings of the members of that Congress.

The PRESIDENT. Please send the letter to the Secretary to be read.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

"OCTOBER 9th, 1874.

"MY DEAR SIR—The next Church Congress is to be held at Stoke-upon-Trent, the Lord Bishop of Lichfield having consented to act as President. A telegraphic message will be sent to the Bishop in the name of the Church Congress, requesting him to invite as many of his Episcopal brethren as possible of the General Convention, to encourage us by their presence and help at Stoke, in October, 1875, as many of them did at the Wolverhampton Church Congress some years ago. As you are now going to America, and may see the President of the Convention, or their Secretary, might I ask you kindly to help forward our desires, and express in my own behalf the extreme gratification which all the Churchmen of England will feel at such loving co-operation?

"Believe me to remain yours very faithfully,

"WILLIAM EMERY,

"Archdeacon and Canon of Ely, Permanent Secretary Church Congress.

"Rev. WM. O. LAMSON."

Rev. Dr. VAN DEUSEN, of Central New York. I would say in explanation that the Archdeacon, while he addressed his communication to Mr. Lamson, intended it for this House, and the volume which I have now to present is also addressed

to this House. Inasmuch as the Lord Bishop of Lichfield would bring the matter before the House of Bishops, it was felt to be unnecessary that he should address them. Mr. Lamson designs, therefore, to bring the matter before this House, and to ask the acknowledgment of this volume, and also that the communication be read. In view of the communication and the presentation of this volume, entitled "Report of the Church Congress at Bath, 1873," I beg leave to offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a communication be addressed to the Venerable Archdeacon and Canon of Ely, by the President and Secretary of this House, acknowledging their grateful receipt of the volume he has given to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and assuring him that this House cordially reciprocate the kind and fraternal feelings expressed in his communication."

The resolution was agreed to unanimously.

PAROCHIAL TEACHING.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 27, from the House of Bishops, proposing an additional section to Canon 19 of Title I., 'Of Parochial Instruction,' respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in the adoption of an additional section to be added to Canon 19, Title I., as proposed by the House of Bishops in their Message No. 27, with the amendment that the said section shall read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Ministers shall also be diligent in teaching the people committed to their charge according to the doctrine of Christ; observing and inculcating Christian holiness of life; rebuking gaming, intemperance, licentious theatrical amusements, and all amusements involving cruelty to the brute creation; reproving all ungodliness, covetousness, and worldliness; exhorting to the maintenance of family worship and the due observance of the Lord's Day; and calling upon parents and sponsors to train their children and godchildren, both by precept and example, faithfully to observe their Baptismal vows."

The resolution was placed on the Calendar.

CANON ON RITUAL.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I am requested to ask permission of the House, on behalf of Rev. Dr. Spalding, who is now upon the floor, to make an explanation personal to himself as a matter of privilege. I suppose there will be no objection to the gentleman making a personal explanation, but he felt some diffidence about it, and I bring the matter thus formally to the attention of the House.

The PRESIDENT. It is not necessary to make any motion. Dr. Spalding rises to a personal explanation.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. I am very much obliged to the House for allowing me to make an explanation. I wanted to explain my vote yesterday, briefly, upon the Canon on Ritual, because, I think, it will occur to every one in the House what sort of construction may be given to our votes on such questions as that. I wanted to state that I was in favor of a Canon on that subject, and I should have voted "aye" on any of the amendments that I heard or read that were offered at that time, and I hoped I would get a chance to vote on them, and then, even if they had been voted down, my position would have been clear to this House and to the General Church on that subject. The reason for my voting as I did was a matter of pure conscientiousness to myself. I had some objections to the Canon as it stood, that I tried very hard to state, not to make a speech,

but simply to state my objections, and to say to the House that I should certainly vote against that Canon if it came to a vote. Several of the speakers stated portions of my objections. One objection I had to the Canon was that it seemed to me to be class legislation; and having been some years a Chaplain to a Legislature, I had noticed that there was a great deal of obnoxiousness attached to that kind of legislation, for it legislates only for one extreme. That was my personal opinion; and that being so, I voted as I did, for I thought false doctrine might just as well be taught by defect as by excess.

Another objection I had was that I recognized the right of the Church—

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Is not this debate on a Canon which has been disposed of?

Mr. KING, of Long Island. If every gentleman gets up and explains, we shall never get through.

The PRESIDENT. I think the matter of personal privilege has been fully accorded.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. I do not want to argue it; but I want to state—["Order!"]

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I do not think it is a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT. Clearly not.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. Then I want to state that I was in favor of a Canon on Ritual, and my objections to that one were purely conscientious—["Order," "Order."]

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. As Dr. Spalding has made his explanation, I want, not to speak on that, but to say to this House one thing.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I object to Dr. Adams going on.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I am going on in regular—

The PRESIDENT. Have you a motion to offer, Dr. Adams?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I have one to offer.

The PRESIDENT. Very well; let us hear it.

PAROCHIAL TEACHING.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I want to say to this House that the resolution which has been brought before us by the Committee on Canons, I think, should be passed now, and should not go on the Calendar; and the reason I would say is, because hitherto the blame has been to this House that instead of legislating with regard to Christian morality and Christian interests, as the ancient Church did, we have been legislating simply upon matters that are of no importance, mere matters of regulation with regard to the motions of clergy and laity. ["Order," "Order."]

The PRESIDENT. You are out of order. The matter has passed from the House.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I understand that it was not passed.

The PRESIDENT. It has gone upon the Calendar without any vote, but it will come again, and you will have an opportunity to be heard on it very soon, I hope.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I have been told by a gentleman—

The PRESIDENT. But the gentleman does not understand it. (Laughter.)

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. For the benefit of the gentleman, I move to reconsider the vote putting it on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. There is no vote. The thing has passed to the Calendar under the rule. Let us go on with the regular business.

PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I have a report from the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, which I desire to submit.

The report was read by the Secretary, as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments of the Constitution, to whom were referred Memorials and other papers presenting the question of the expediency of devising a 'Provincial System for the Church,' having had the same under consideration, respectfully report:

"1. Your Committee assume that the terms 'Provincial system' are used in the resolution in their full ecclesiastical and primitive sense. In the early Church there were: 1, the Parish; 2, the Diocese; 3, the Province; 4, the Patriarchate. The Parish had its Priest, the Diocese its Bishop, the Province its Archbishop, the Patriarchate its Patriarch. Among these, the dominant and most active power was the Province with its Archbishop. Speaking generally, we may say that it possessed the powers of this body and of the House of Bishops, and many of the powers of our Diocesan Councils. The Provinces were disconnected and independent, except as, by very slender ties, they were united in the Patriarchate. Such a system would dismember this Church, and out of this now compact, now united body, create five, or seven, or ten separate Churches. The ties which may at first unite them will grow weaker and weaker. However similar they may be at the moment of dismemberment, at that moment the process of divergence will begin, and it will go on until the separation will be as great as that now existing between York and Canterbury. Those Provinces now communicate with each other only informally. At the preliminary and very important Lambeth Conference, the Bishops of York did not attend, because it was convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury. If the words 'Province' and 'Provincial system' mean anything, they mean all this.

"If these terms, as used in the resolution, do not have as broad a signification as that given them above, it is respectfully submitted that they ought not to be used. Having a well-defined signification in the nomenclature of church polity, their use in another sense must create confusion and misconception.

"2. The unity and unexampled prosperity now enjoyed by the Church is mainly to be attributed, under Divine Providence, to its simple but efficient organization under one supreme authority in the General Convention, restrained only by the Ecclesiastical Constitution established by the piety and forecast of our fathers.

"3. No fundamental change should be in that organization without the clearest evidence of urgent necessity, and then only in the Constitutional mode, by carefully prepared Amendments to the Constitution, proposed and passed by the General Convention, to be submitted to the clergy and laity in each of the Dioceses for their due consideration, before its second passage in the next General Convention.

"4. In framing or enlarging the organization of the Apostolic Church in the United States of America, as one great Province of the Church Catholic, there was not, nor is there now, any Scriptural or other necessity for adopting or following any example of local organization in any other country or age. The Church, in any of the nations of Christendom, is fully and plainly at liberty at all times to conform its local organization to its local conditions and necessities.

"5. No evidence has yet been furnished by experience of any action or want of action by the General Convention of the Church in the United States, which requires any large surrender or delegation of its powers to provinces, or groups of Dioceses, representing only separate portions of the Church.

"6. Any such surrender, practically establishing independent Churches, must eventually and inevitably operate to undermine and overthrow the par-

amount authority of the General Convention, vitally necessary for preserving the unity of the Church.

"7. In view of the continental extent of the Church, already reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and requiring personal supervision of its widespread subdivisions, the present House of Bishops is not too numerous, but may be gradually and wisely increased in number, to keep pace with the growth of the Church.

"8. If the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies should hereafter become too numerous for convenient and efficient action, the evil may be promptly remedied without any fundamental change in the character of our ecclesiastical structure, by constitutional amendments from time to time reducing the number of Deputies from each of the Dioceses, whenever rendered necessary by their increase in number.

"9. No intermediate provinces are needed for exercising any powers already possessed by the Diocesan Conventions, while any other powers granted to provinces must necessarily be subtracted from the General Convention, which would be thereby enfeebled to the same extent.

"10. Any institution of provinces, or Provincial Synods, with powers subject at all times to revocation by the General Convention, would be useless and illusory. The Provinces, if invested with irrevocable powers, and discharged from the constant and necessary authority and supervision of the General Convention, certainly might, and probably would, soon diverge into widely differing practices and opinions, engendering ecclesiastical conflicts, threatening the unity of our Church.

"11. Apart from these fearful consequences in the future, reaching far down the coming ages, the separation of our Church into geographical and sectional provinces would work immediate injury, in discontinuing or rendering less frequent the General Conventions (now triennial) of the Bishops, and the representatives of the clergy and laity, in which fraternal assemblies, the efforts of all to advance the highest interests of the Church, and especially its widespread missionary labors, are encouraged and invigorated, thereby more closely uniting our now undivided Church in a perpetual bond of Christian sympathy and affection.

"Fully impressed with the convictions now expressed, the Committee recommend the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That, in the judgment of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, it is not expedient to establish a Provincial system for this Church.

"CHAS. H. HALL, Chairman.

J. A. DUDLEY, Jr.,
SAMUEL B. RUGGLES,
J. W. STEVENSON,
GEO. F. COMSTOCK,
W. F. BULLOCK,
G. W. RACE,
E. T. WILDER,
EDMUND H. BENNETT,
ISAAC HAZLEHURST."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the order of the day for to-morrow, at twelve o'clock, be all the reports relating to amendments to the Constitution, that they may be taken up and disposed of.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. Was it not the order of the House that the question of the Hymnal be taken up immediately after the matter which was disposed of yesterday, and then immediately after that the report on the baptismal office?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I will modify my motion by saying that the reports of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution be taken up and disposed of after existing orders.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that after disposing of the existing special orders the various re-

ports of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments be taken up and considered until disposed of. The motion was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS FOR TEXAS.

A message (No. 52) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the House does hereby constitute the counties of Cass, Titus, Upshur, Wood, Rains, Vantandz, Henderson, Navarro, Hill, Basque, Hamilton, Brown, Coleman, and Runnels, together with all the counties lying north and northwesterly thereof in the State of Texas, and also all the territory north of the county of Tom Green, in said State, a Missionary District, to be known as the Missionary District of Northern Texas ; also the counties of Calhoun, Jackson, Lewaca, Gonzales, Caldwell, Hayes, Blanco, Llano, San Saba, McCulloch, Concho, Tom Green, Pecos, and El Paso, together with all the counties and territory in said State south and southwesterly thereof, into a Missionary District of Western Texas.

"And the House of Bishops further informs the House of Deputies that it has nominated as Missionary Bishop of Northern Texas the Rev. Alexander Charles Garrett, D.D., of the Diocese of Nebraska, Dean of Trinity Cathedral, Nebraska ; and as Missionary Bishop of Western Texas, the Rev. Robert W. B. Elliott, of the Diocese of Georgia, Rector of St. Philip's Church, Atlanta, in said Diocese."

MISSIONARY BISHOP FOR CALIFORNIA.

A message (No. 53) from the House of Bishops, announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That this House does hereby constitute the counties of Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Sacramento, Amador and El Dorado, together with all counties lying north thereof in the State of California, a Missionary District, to be known as the Missionary District of Northern California.

"And the House of Bishops further informs the House of Deputies that it has nominated as Missionary Bishop of Northern California, the Rev. John H. D. Wingfield, D.D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Petersburg, Virginia."

THE HYMNAL.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I call for the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The Hymnal was appointed to come up immediately after the matter which was yesterday disposed of.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I call for the order of the day, and would like to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDENT. The Hymnal is the special order.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Yes, sir, and I offer this resolution in regard to it.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. Is the Hymnal in order now ?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir, it is called for, and I suppose the House had better be informed as to the precise form in which it comes before us. Dr. Huntington has risen to offer a resolution in reference to it. The Committee on the Hymnal submit a report without a resolution, and there is a message from the House of Bishops on the same subject.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. May I ask the Secretary distinctly to state in what form the order of the day is now before us ?

The SECRETARY. The report of the Committee on the Hymnal, with the request of the Committee to be discharged. Then there is a message from the House of Bishops which is to be taken from its place

on the Calendar, if it be so desired, and considered with this. It has not been so ordered yet.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I move, then, that the message of the House of Bishops be taken from the Calendar and considered in this connection, and I will offer my resolution as an amendment to their message.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to take the message of the House of Bishops on the Hymnal from the Calendar, and consider that in connection with this order of the day.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I have the floor, and decline to allow any resolution to be offered until I present my own. I took the floor yesterday, and gave way for an adjournment, supposing that I would have the floor when it came up to-day.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. First let us hear the resolution of the House of Bishops.

The SECRETARY. Message No. 32, from the House of Bishops, announced the passage by that House of the following resolutions :

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That future editions of the Hymnal shall be printed so as to conform to the revised edition presented by the Joint Committee on the Hymnal, and that no other hymns be allowed in the public worship of the Church except the Hymnal as thus revised, and such hymns and psalms as are now ordinarily bound up with the Book of Common Prayer, provided that any congregation may continue to use the editions of the Hymnal heretofore published, until further action of the Convention.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Hymnal, in pursuance of their own request, be discharged.

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has also adopted the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops desires here to place upon record their sense of the singular zeal and assiduity of the Joint Committee in the laborious task confided to them for the sound discretion which they have exhibited, and of their patience and kindness in considering objections, and in endeavoring to meet the wishes of the Church, and that a copy of this resolution be communicated to the House of Deputies."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Mr. President—

Mr. STARK, of Connecticut. Will the gentleman from Long Island give way to allow a motion to be made in relation to debate on this matter ? I wish to move to limit the time of speakers in this debate to fifteen minutes.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I will give way for that.

Mr. STARK, of Connecticut. I move that the speeches in the debate on the matter now before the House be limited to fifteen minutes.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I would amend by saying "ten minutes."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Deputy from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion as amended, to limit the speeches in this debate to ten minutes by each speaker.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The business before the House is the report of the Hymnal Committee, asking to be discharged ; with that the resolution of the House of Bishops as read by the Secretary. After that I shall propose the following resolutions :

"Resolved, That this House concur in Message No. 32 of the House of Bishops.

"Resolved, also, That it is the sense of this Convention that the revised Hymnal now set forth is not regarded as a finality, but that it is authorized

for the time being, as a tentative process toward a more perfect and acceptable Hymnal for the Church."

The question, as I suppose it to be put to us now, is whether we shall go into an interminable critical discussion of the Hymnal, or whether we shall condone the past three years and drop it out, and take these two books and do the best we can with them for a short time to come. It is understood that the House of Bishops propose that this matter shall run along for at least nine years. They cannot bind us, and we cannot bind the next General Convention. All we have to do, I imagine, is to take the two Hymnals precisely as they stand. But, unfortunately, the first thing I have to do is to apologize. The binder, at least in some instances, has managed to get into many of the copies here two sets of hymns—in some cases some from the old edition, and also some from the new that should be substituted by the use of the old plates. We shall have to unravel them in the best way we can.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. Do I understand Dr. Hall to say that only in a few copies of the Hymnal, as first issued, the binder failed to put in the sheet of corrections, and that all hereafter to be printed will be found correct?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. All will be found correct. It was a mistake of the binder in binding the revised Hymnal. Some of you, probably, can see that the plates have been got in wrong, and things a little mixed in consequence of this difficulty; but with a little care, probably, the correction can be made.

Again, it is known to the Convention that there were certain matters happening three years ago in regard to the getting out of the edition whereby it appears from the remarkable labor and the very worthy labor of our good brother from Georgia, as he first thought, there were two thousand mistakes—

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. I corrected that afterwards, and reduced them to fifteen hundred.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I was going to say twenty-five per cent. would be taken off. Fifteen hundred is a heavy load; but many are merely the changes of numbers, and a great many are changes of commas and things of that kind.

The sheet of "corrections" in the first edition (which is in the hands of members) shows the changes in the new edition; they show its accuracy, and they are not offered, as I understand, simply in the light of being faults, but as mistakes that were made then. I am going to grant all this, grant that these mistakes were made between the first edition and the second, the question would then arise what powers the Committee supposed themselves to have. It seems that it was stated by Dr. Howe in this House:

"The Committee will ask to be continued until the new General Convention, and then I submit that if their request to be continued should be granted, and this Hymnal should in any sense be adopted, members of this House and any other members of the Church who have any suggestions to make touching the Hymnal shall communicate them in writing to any member of this Committee, they will have due consideration. They will ask to be continued for the purpose of typographical, verbal, and other emendation."

That seems to have been the understanding in this House, and I am informed was decidedly the understanding in the other House why the Committee should be continued.

I am going to grant that they stretched their powers; I am going to grant that they made a mistake; I am going to grant that there was some difference of opinion between them and the very learned gentleman on hymnology, who made the final corrections. Supposing it ought to be so, "what

are you going to do about it?" as was once asked by a distinguished gentleman who is spending his time in the suburbs of this city. [Laughter.] We have punished these men already; they have been taken, and by the strong arm have been made Bishops and sent wandering around Dioceses. [Laughter.] We ought not to reflect on them further. They have done a great deal of labor for which they have not been thanked; they have taken up a work that I do believe Bishop White was wise in forecasting forty or fifty years ago would be very disastrous whenever it came up in this Convention, and that is, undertaking to criticise a Hymnal in a public body. If we grant all these facts, if we see evidently that what has passed is to be condoned and passed over, it seems to me that the plain, square issue is simply this: Shall we take a revised Hymnal that has now had the benefit of valuable suggestions from various parts of the country, or shall we have none? We have had a valuable paper from Pennsylvania; we view this as a contribution towards a future perfected Hymnal. We can certainly use this Hymnal as it now is, and we are bound not to change it more than is necessary, because we see that in the last few months the funds of that charitable society to which the royalty on the Hymnal goes have been diminished by these criticisms. You have entered into engagements with publishers, so that twelve thousand and more dollars have been gathered as the royalty on the very large amount that has been invested by these publishers. One of them said to me, "I have eight thousand dollars in the Hymnal; I went into it, supposing that it was to be a matter that was not to be thrown up certainly in three years."

It seems to me, therefore, looking on every side of the case, that the pure and simple question is to accept the revised Hymnal as the Bishops proposed it to us; to have the same royalty extended to it as upon the other; to allow the old copies to wear out, and the plates, after being reformed, will give us this revised Hymnal.

The advantages of the revised Hymnal, I understand, are: 1, The general criticism that it has received. It has been under fire. It certainly has been riddled from end to end by bullets and hot shot of all kinds for the last year. Every kind of objection has been urged against it that can be imagined, so that we know about where we stand. I remind you that there is no such thing as a perfect Hymnal. There is no such thing as a perfect Hymnal in this Church of all others. Why? Because in this Church certain things are to be tolerated, as it is agreed all around, and compromised. There are hymns in the book that I never use and do not want to use. I do not want for example any anapaestic lines like

"The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold,

His cohorts all gleaming with purple and gold."

[Laughter.] They may be very well for Sunday-schools, but not for a hymn for my people. There are hymns the doctrine of which I do not quite like. There are hymns the taste of which I do not like; but there are many of these hymns that my people have been using for three years with perfect satisfaction. When I first came on the "Hymns Ancient and Modern," and then came to this Hymnal, it seemed to me as if I had been kept in a dark room in regard to hymnology by the Church for a very long time. There is sufficient in this Hymnal for us all to use and enjoy.

The expense of changing the plates as now proposed will be less than \$100. I mean for the ordinary copies, and not much more for the Hymnals with tunes.

The Committee have presented to us now the final digested action, criticised as largely as it has been,

that has approved itself to their wisdom. If the debate, then, may be confined to the main point, it seems to me that we may at last be able to get at a safe conclusion. I offer, then, this resolution, that we discharge the Committee, and that we concur with the message of the House of Bishops, but that it is the sense of this House that the revised Hymnal now set forth is not regarded as a finality, but that it is authorized for the time being as a tentative process and contribution toward a more perfect and acceptable Hymnal of the future.

Then I think it will be proper that a resolution by Mr. Pierrepont should be appended, taking care of the royalty which has been carefully prepared, and then it seems to me we may go to some other business.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I wish to ask a question. Am I to understand that the words just stated by the member from Long Island are to be incorporated in this resolution? Are they a part of this resolution? Are these limitations to come at the end of the resolution of the House of Bishops?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I am asked whether I offer this resolution as a part of the vote of the whole question. I do.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as the resolution I have to offer is in direct conflict with the principle of the resolution offered by the Deputy from Long Island, I am obliged reluctantly to propose it as a substitute. The object of my resolution is to call attention to an oversight in the report of the Committee as coming from the House of Bishops. Before doing so, however, and in order that we may have the whole subject intelligently before us, I would call up from the Calendar, with the permission of the House, the message of the House of Bishops relating to Church music. We shall then have the whole subject before us.

The SECRETARY. That is not on the Calendar, but before the Committee on Canons. It can be read, however. ["Read."] Message No. 23 from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), that the following Canon be adopted:

"Of Church Music.

"It shall be the duty of every minister of this Church, with such assistance as he can obtain from persons skilled in music, to give order concerning the tunes to be sung at any time in his Church; and, especially, it shall be his duty to suppress all light and unseemly music, and all indecency and irreverence in the performance, by which vain and ungodly persons profane the service of the sanctuary.

"And, further, that this Canon be numbered Canon 21, of Title I., and that the present Canon be numbered Canon 22.

"Resolved, (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That this Canon be printed in place of the resolution on the same subject heretofore prefixed to the Psalms in Metre and the Hymnal."

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. The resolutions I have to offer will test the mind of this Convention as to whether it is our wish that this Hymnal should be, so far as we have it in our power to make it so, a permanency, and in speaking in behalf of making it a permanency, I know that while I shall be opposed by Deputies who have come here with special theories of Hymnology to carry through, I shall have the grateful support, if not of this Convention, I am sure of the large body of the worshippers of this Church throughout the land.

I would call attention to the fact, which I said

had been overlooked, that the third page of the Hymnal, as revised and reported to us, is obsolete, and that we shall be guilty of a solecism if we pass it without amendment, because it is all future in its language, and deals with contingencies, and, moreover, states that this Hymnal shall not be bound up with the Book of Common Prayer until order to that effect shall be taken by the General Convention, a resolution which has stood in the way of the convenience, not only of publishers, but of worshippers, and which, I am sure, we all want to get out of the way.

I would also, before I read my resolutions, forewarn you against supposing that they in any way conflict with the copyright privileges; on the contrary, they are intended more securely to guarantee those privileges, for the point has been raised by a publisher in my hearing—a point not well taken, I think, but still one that may be raised—that our copyright is invalidated by this revision. That is a point which I have submitted to a lawyer, and on which I have received from him an adverse decision. Nevertheless it will be well thus to guard against any such question, if we can. These are my resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That in place of the certificate and decision printed on the third page of the revised edition of the Hymnal, the following authentication, duly certified by the proper officers, be substituted, viz.:

"By the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in General Convention, in the year of our Lord 1870, this revised Hymnal is set forth and allowed to be used in all congregations of the said Church, and to be bound up with the Book of Common Prayer.

"This Hymnal as now revised is free to be printed and published by all responsible publishers, who shall obtain a license to that effect from the Trustees of the Fund for the relief of widows and orphans of destitute clergymen, and of aged, infirm, and disabled clergymen, and who shall assure to such Trustees a payment, to be applied to the uses of said fund, equivalent to ten per cent. upon the retail selling price; and that the copyright of the Hymnal shall vest in the said Trustees.

"No hymns other than those contained in this Hymnal may lawfully be used in the public worship of this Church, save that it shall be lawful to use the Book of Psalms in Metre and hymns set forth in 1832, as well as the Hymnal set forth in 1871, until action to the contrary shall be taken by the General Convention.

"Foot Note.—That Anthems in the words of the Holy Scripture or of the Book of Common Prayer may at any time be used instead of Hymns.

"Resolved, That to the sentence on the fourth page of the Revised Hymnal be appended the words, 'From the joint resolution of the General Convention of 1832.'"

I state that because we have here now an entirely anonymous announcement in quotation marks on the fourth page, with no reference whatever to the source from which it comes. I also introduce the point in regard to anthems, because it legalizes and authorizes a usage which has obtained in this Church in compliance with a very old recommendation of the House of Bishops, and because it meets also objections that may be raised by unintelligent and misinformed persons in congregations of this Church, who suppose that their Rectors are taking undue liberties in introducing anthems into the worship. The authority to which I refer, kindly furnished me by the Historiographer of the Church, may be found in the first volume of Bioren's Journal, page 213.

"It could not but give satisfaction to the Bishops

to recollect that anthems taken from Scripture, and judiciously arranged, may, according to the known allowance of this Church, be sung in congregations at the discretion of their respective ministers."

In place of this vague and only imperfectly recommended suggestion, I offer a distinct resolution. I now ask that these resolutions of mine be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the proposed resolutions.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I offer this proposition as an amendment to the motion for concurrence with the House of Bishops.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I know so well the value of the remaining time that it was not necessary for such speakers as myself that the resolution, limiting debate to ten minutes, should have been passed. I rise to one point which is, I think, of great importance. It is this—either that the Committee should not be discharged, or that some committee should sit to make alterations which have escaped this Committee, and in some cases very many of those who have had this subject under special consideration.

I am very glad to say my little say at the opening of this debate, for I know that the numbers of those who are opposed to the Hymnal is legion, and that this Convention will have a work of exorcism to do before we settle this question.

The Hymnal is wanted. The Committee has done a great and laborious work, I had almost said a thankless work, in preparing this Hymnal. Sir, I like the Hymnal. I do not consider it a perfect work, and it is not in the power either of this body, or of any Committee, or of any individual man to make a work on this subject that will pass reasonably through the hands of poets and critics at any time. I do not propose to touch the question of the principle upon which hymns should be written. I do not propose to show my knowledge of St. Augustine and his views. I do propose to say, however, that in many cases that principle is one in seeming and not in reality. I mean to say that if a hymn should be always in the form of ascription of praise to God or of apostrophe to Him, we should lose some of the very best hymns we have, some that are I was about to say almost essential to our public worship. One of the most distinguished Presbyters in this House said to me, "I hope nothing will be done to turn out such a hymn as 'Onward, Christian Soldiers,' for my children"—he spoke of his children in the Lord—"take the roof off the house when they sing it." [Laughter.] So it is with many others. Specially the Committee of the Convention of the Diocese of Pennsylvania has noticed a hymn of Montgomery—"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire"—and that Committee does not consider the matter as relegated into a hymn of proper ascription and apostrophe by the closing stanzas, beginning "Oh, Thou, by whom we come to God."

Now it seems to me that very often it is only in the form that we have not this ascription, that we have not this apostrophe. You have it there; you have it concentrated and made powerful and beautiful at the close; and yet such a hymn would be turned out on this theory. Let any great calamity come over this land, as within the memory of those in this Convention there has been, let a solemn service be ordained in order that we may express our feelings and vent our grief, and in nine cases out of ten the hymn is given out,

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform,"

and yet that would be pronounced objectionable on this principle.

But I do not propose to dwell upon this point. Alterations are proposed in hymns, and alterations have been made in many of the hymns in the Hymnal which are æsthetical, doctrine, or simply lyrical.

I am willing to grant that where an alteration is simply æsthetical, not much harm might be done, though it seems to imply a necessity for change, for much of our best poetry is not infused with a lyric spirit. It is where doctrine is touched, principally, that I think we do great injustice to those who wrote these hymns.

Sir, we talk about copyright; we talk about an international copyright for all those who write in the English language. We know that if a man's work is touched he goes to the law and the law immediately redresses the wrong. We know that if we quote in any literary performance from authors old or new, let us take Homer, if you please, the scholar will mark any alteration that he makes in brackets, so that it may be known which was Homer's work and which is his. No one would think of quoting Milton or Shakespeare in something which should be considered of high literary character without taking that precaution. Now, sir, the authors who have given us some of our finest hymns are dead. They want not the money that the copyright brings; but the fame—the holy fame, if I may so speak. Sir, they are not only dead, but they are immortal, and it is to preserve the character of doctrine, the æsthetic power, and the logical force of these men that I stand here.

I like the Hymnal. I want these alterations made for the good of the Church. I should rather, therefore, lay down the principle that no alteration shall be made in the hymns of authors who have gone before us, than that there should be any alteration in doctrine. If a hymn be erroneous in doctrine, as some of the hymns of the Eastern Church may be according to our standard; as some of the mediæval Latin hymns are, let us put such aside, sorrowfully, if you please, that we cannot use the good, but let us put them aside reverently.

I wish to call the attention of the Convention, by one illustration, to an alteration that has been made in a hymn, and I hope that this will sufficiently strengthen the position that I have taken, that either this Committee should not be discharged, or that the work of carefully examining and revising the subject for the further consideration of the next Convention should be put into some hands.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There is only one member of the Committee on the part of this House left; the others have been made Bishops.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I hope there are a number of clerical members here who would not be averse to being put on the new committee on that account. [Laughter.] If gentlemen will turn to the 265th hymn in the Revised Hymnal, they will see a set of alterations which I think will show something more than a design to alter—something like perfunctory work on the part of the Committee. I have said that they have done hard work, and careful work, usually; but here is a case in which they have failed to do the work well, and if there were no other illustrations to be given, it seems to me that this would be sufficient to keep this matter in the hands of a learned and critical committee. If the gentlemen of the Convention will merely look at the Hymn, No. 265, while I give them the original version of St. Anatolius as translated by Neale, they will see what I mean. Please observe that this Hymn is an illustration of that clause in the Nicene Creed which declares that Christ is God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God.

Hymn 265, as in the Revised Hymnal :

I.

"Fierce was the wild billow,
Dark was the night;
Oars labored heavily,
Foam glistened white;
Mariners trembled—(*Trembled the mariners*)
Peril was nigh—(*Peril was high*)
Then said the God of God,
'Peace! it is I.'

II.

"Ridge of the mountain-wave,
Lower thy crest;
Wail of the tempest wind—(*Wail of Euroclydon*)
Be thou at rest.
Peril can none be,—(*Sorrow can never be*)
Sorrow must fly,—(*Darkness must fly*)
When saith the Light of Light,
'Peace! it is I.'

I have given here the first and second stanzas of this hymn, as one among numerous illustrations of unwarrantable alterations in the original of hymns.

The alterations are in the body of the hymn: the original lines are found on the right in brackets.

They speak for themselves. The chief error is in the second stanza, where the very idea of the author is lost—i.e., that *darkness* is dissipated by the Light of Light.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up. Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I move that his time be extended.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I will ask only three minutes. ["Go on."]

For what purpose this alteration was made it is utterly impossible for me to think.

Mr. PIERREPONT, of Long Island. That is one of the copies in which the wrong plates were put in by the binder, from whose edition I have in my hand a correct copy.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I beg your pardon; it is exactly the same:

"Peril can none be,
Sorrow must fly,
When saith the Light of Light,
'Peace! it is I.'"

I have already given the original:

"Sorrow can never be,
Darkness must fly,
When saith the Light of Light,
'Peace! it is I.'"

In the first stanza the dactylic measure is destroyed in the line, "Mariners trembled," and for what purpose I cannot understand.

The original of this hymn was written by a person who knew what he wanted to say, and he said it in very good Greek. Neale translated it very literally and very beautifully. It is now intended for the use of people on the mid-Atlantic, and I cannot see why "wail of Euroclydon" should have been stricken out and "wail of the tempest-wind" inserted.

I shall not take up the time of the Convention. I wish I had a little more time. I hope that the Committee will be continued or another committee appointed, and proper alterations, of which I have given only one illustration, will be made.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say. There is before us in the first place a joint resolution of the House of Bishops, the report of our Committee, and an amendment proposed by the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts. I am in favor, let me say, of

passing the resolution sent down by the House of Bishops, and the report of the Committee; and I am opposed to the proposition of the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts and for this reason. Everybody knows that there is nothing which is lawful, or can be made lawful by the General Convention, except it be passed by Canon. When, therefore, a joint resolution is passed here, whatever else it is, it is not law. That is a thing which does not need to be proved. Every lawyer in this House, every Canonist, everybody who has been a member of it for any length of time, knows distinctly that whatever may be the force of a joint resolution, it never can have the force of law. It has force, very great force, it has very great moral force; it has such force that it seems to me every loyal person connected with this Church must submit to it. But at the same time it cannot have the force of law. When, therefore, the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts brings in a resolution which speaks as though this resolution could give the Hymnal the force of law, and states that it is unlawful to do this or the other thing, he is simply stating a thing which is incorrect, and I suppose that the mind of this Church has felt that, and that is the reason why this Hymnal has never been enforced by Canon.

Whatever authority it has had comes from its being adopted by a joint resolution. I suppose the reason for that is that, in the words of the Committee, it cannot be regarded as a finality. It is a tentative thing; it is a contribution towards a Hymnal. We are not in a position to make it permanent; and however one may value this Hymnal, however much he may approve of it, I suppose it is impossible to persuade a majority of this House that at the present time we would on any account accept it as a finality, and make it unlawful to use anything else, however undesirable it may be to use anything else.

Now, I want to say a single word on that subject, which does not affect the action of this House. If I were able to make an amendment to the joint resolution brought down from the House of Bishops, I should propose to omit the words "no other hymns may be used." I do not make that amendment, because I am quite sure at this stage of the proceedings, and under the current impression that prevails in this House, it would not pass. I only want to say one word by way of protest against this idea of this Hymnal being a finality, or that it is undesirable that we should use in the Divine service other Hymns than those in this Hymnal.

I would like to ask how, after all, it is that we get good hymns. Is it from the decisions of committees? Do committees, after all, do anything but register the thought and mind of the Church on the subject of hymns? This is easily seen if you will only consider how difficult it would be for a committee really to select a good hymn. In the first place, in order to select a good hymn, a man has got to have a knowledge of poetry; in the next place, he has got to have a knowledge of what is the kind of poetry that makes up a proper hymn. In the third place, inasmuch as hymns are meant to be sung, he ought to have a certain knowledge of music; and because the hymns are to be used and sung in divine worship it is necessary that he should be sound in theology.

Now, when you consider the character of a committee, and how unlikely it is that there will be on it all these things combined, much more all these things combined in the majority, you can readily understand how very difficult it must be for any Committee to make up, except they register the voice of the Church, a proper hymn. Indeed, the result of the action of

most Committees on this subject is to do what some one spoke of here yesterday; that is, make a compromise; leave out certain hymns and put in certain others, leaving out certain hymns which have what they consider objectionable expressions. Now, I think that this Church will have learned one thing; that whatever else you may say of the benefit of compromises, they are paralyzing; they have the effect of preventing people from doing anything. Of all other things, a hymn needs to be free; it needs to express the heart and life and emotions and affections of the people; and hymns that are built up, and hymnals that are constructed on a principle of compromise, never can be a finality in a free Church.

I want, now, to say another word. There is something very remarkable about this Hymnal that we have before us, and I never have seen the attention of the people called to it. It consists of some five hundred hymns, and in that Hymnal there are actually, though there are five hundred of them, only thirty-nine written by American writers, and of those thirty-nine hymns there are only ten written by men who were churchmen, and of those ten churchmen who wrote those hymns there are only three living, and two of those wrote translations. In other words, at this present moment in the American Church, there is only one man living who has written a hymn that is allowed to be used in our Hymnal, and this is a name which I can mention to the honor and reverence of all of us, the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg, of St. Luke's Hospital. So I say that that distinguished gentleman stands on a solitary eminence, all alone in the icy, cold fact that he is the solitary American clergyman who has written a hymn for the American Church to sing.

Look into these 520 hymns, and what do you find? You will find no less than 202 hymns that have been written by writers who have lived since the year 1800 in England or Scotland, and of these 202 hymns 74 are written by living English writers, and the reason is this: that the Church of England, bound as she is by the State, has nevertheless permitted free singing and free hymn-writing. I have an illustration of it, which was fortunately brought to my notice within the past two years. When the Church of England established that day of intercession for missionary purposes (a plan which we have adopted in this country), they wanted hymns to sing, and the Rev. F. J. Stone, who wrote that beautiful hymn which we sang at the opening of the Convention, "The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ, our Lord," knew that there was a chance for hymns, and so he wrote two for the day of intercession, two grand hymns. A clergyman of the Church of England knows, and a layman of the Church of England knows, that if God the Holy Ghost has given him the power to write a hymn and to sing it, there is a chance that it will be borne up to heaven upon the tide of the worship of the Church; and an American knows that he has not the slightest chance. The only chance he has is the brief immortality which may come in the columns of some of our admirable Church papers; and so this way of making hymns is simply an interdict upon hymnology. It is saying to the American Church, "Do not let your hearts go forth to God in hymns; we will borrow from England and Scotland."

I have not anything to say, except that I want to make my protest against these bonds and shackles and fetters. I go for freedom, because, in the words of Holy David, the Church of God is for ever swelling in its heart with its word, and year after year it wants to burst forth with "sing unto the Lord"—not the hymns that we borrow, but "sing unto the Lord a new song."

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, inasmuch as I did not consume the ten minutes allotted to me by the wise rule of this House, I venture to avail myself of my privilege of speaking twice in the same debate, to use a few moments in which to puncture the argument of the Deputy from Wisconsin.

To the latter part of this argument I have nothing to say. I remember well hearing it three years ago in Baltimore, and being struck by its eloquence; but I submit that this question is not upon the merits of the collection, but upon another point entirely. And I shall address myself wholly to his argument in regard to the legal point. It is not new to me. It was urged upon me in my own Diocese by a clergyman who was using in his Church "Hymns Ancient and Modern;" and he justified himself to me by saying that the Hymnal was only in force by a joint resolution. Now I propose to meet that point fairly and squarely, and I meet it by calling the attention of the ingenious Deputy from Wisconsin to the fact that we sing hymns in this Church only by permission; and the joint resolution undertakes to say what hymns we are permitted to sing. Now, sir, I ask the Deputy from Wisconsin, who has denied that joint resolutions have the weight of law, whether a Rubric has the force of law.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Certainly, he says. Now I read from one Rubric, and I might read from others, in the Book of Common Prayer; I read from the Rubric in the Holy Communion, where it is most fit that it should stand:

"Here shall be sung a hymn or part of a hymn, from the selection for the fasts and feasts."

I submit that if a joint resolution upon this subject has no force, then this Church is put in the singularly false and absurd position of enjoining something that cannot be done.

Now, sir, I do not insist particularly upon the word "lawfully," in my resolution. If it will aid the gentleman from Wisconsin in voting for it, I will very cheerfully strike it out. All I ask for that resolution is that it shall have the same force as that injunction in regard to light and unseemly music. Does the gentleman wish to consider that that is an open question?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. That has come down to us as a Canon.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. But as it has stood in the Prayer-Book, it has stood on the force of a joint resolution.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Still, I think that everybody has seen that it had not the force of law, and, consequently, the Bishops, feeling that, have sent it down to us this time as a Canon, so as to give it the force of law.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Be that as it may—and there is some force in the remark of the Deputy from Wisconsin—my main argument is irrefragable, that in our Rubrics the Church requires the singing of hymns, and in her Hymnal she sets forth such hymns as may be sung, and no others.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I am very sorry, Mr. President, to be obliged to address myself, even in a few words, to this House, for, in the first place, I am not in a fit physical condition to do so; and, in the next place, I supposed that I was under bonds to my reverend friend from Long Island to keep my mouth shut on this subject.

A resolution comes down as in the nature of a joint resolution from the House of Bishops, which you have heard read. I propose to offer in this House an amendment taking away what I fear from the character of that resolution may be considered to be the quality of finality in this Hymnal. That resolu-

tion was accepted, and now comes down to this lower House for action. There is every reason, I think, why this Hymnal should not be accepted as a finality by the Church; and my Rev. brother, the Deputy from Massachusetts, will probably be surprised to learn that, in offering his amendment, he is going far beyond the intention or the desire of the Committee on the Hymnal in the other House, or the House of Bishops itself.

There are several general reasons against making this book a finality. There are three ways in which a Hymnal may be endeavored to be reached. One is that adopted in the English Church; another is a distinctly tentative one, such as I supposed we were pursuing here; and the third is that of dumb acquiescence and acceptance, and this I take it to be the method in fact which the Rev. Deputy from Massachusetts professes that we should adopt or accept in this case.

It is commonly supposed in this country that the allowing of all hymns to be sung in the English Church is a necessity forced upon that Church by reason of the difficulty of reaching any distinct action by that Church on this subject, or any other. If any one supposes that this is the fact, I would simply refer him to so high an authority as Sir Roundell Palmer, who maintains—taking precisely, I think, the view of the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin—that it is the best condition of things. I will not enlarge upon this point. I only wish to show that there are strong reasons why no Hymnal should be accepted as final, and forced by law upon the use of the Church.

The other method is the distinctly tentative one, and I supposed we had been pursuing, and were understood to be pursuing, this method in this Church. It is the view, I believe, of the whole of the Committee on the Hymnal; it is the view of the House of Bishops, if I am not mistaken.

I said that the Deputy from Massachusetts went beyond the whole Committee on Hymnal and beyond the Upper House. I say, on good authority, that the resolution of that House, so far as it seems to have any declaration of finality in this matter, was passed under two distinct influences in that Upper House. First of all, it is a resolution of despair. They entered upon a most difficult work. They found themselves criticised on all hands, and they simply submit for themselves, "we are unwilling to enter any further on this work; if you are to have it prosecuted still more, you must appoint another committee for it." That was the idea in the passage of their resolution. Then came secondly the question of the royalty. You will remember that this Convention granted a royalty to certain publishers in the matter of the Hymnal. This royalty action is now pleaded in bar of any further revision of the Hymnal. But I do think the matter of the Hymnal of this Church one of too great importance to be stopped by any such considerations as those which I have mentioned. I believe that the Church as a body is not prepared to accept this Hymn Book as something final to be bound solely to its use, and, therefore, I trust that this House will think more and think much before they do anything that will give countenance to that idea, by any resolution of their going, as I have said, beyond the wish, or the desire, or the expectation, of the Hymnal Committee themselves, and make this book something that we are obliged to use.

ELECTION OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair would remind the House that there was an order of the day appointed for twelve o'clock—the election of a Missionary Bishop to China. The House will determine whether to go on with the present matter and postpone that

order, or take up the order and complete it, and then resume the question of the Hymnal.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. I suggest that, as there are three other nominations besides that for the Episcopate to China to come before the House, the consideration of the China Bishop be postponed, and fixed for the same times that the other cases are to be considered.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that they all be fixed for four o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the order of the day be postponed until four o'clock this afternoon, and that at the same time the other messages from the House of Bishops, nominating Missionary Bishops, be taken up.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Are we obliged to go into secret session on these nominations? ["Yes, yes."] Would it not be more convenient to have it at a time when our friends would not have to be turned out? ["Oh, no."]

The motion of Mr. Otis was agreed to.

THE HYMNAL.

The PRESIDENT. The matter of the Hymnal is now before the House.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. Mr. President, I appear in a very embarrassing position as a kind of champion for a child which seems to be abandoned by those who brought it into being. I hold in my hand the book adopted three years ago by an almost unanimous vote of this House, and adopted, I maintain, as a finality; for the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin moved, three years ago, that it be adopted provisionally until the next General Convention, and that motion was voted down; consequently this book was intended to be final, as much as the action of a General Convention can bind the Church in future. Of course it is possible for any General Convention to revoke the action of a previous Convention; but as far as we could do it, by a vote all but unanimous, this is the child of the last General Convention, and is the Hymnal of the Church [holding up the Hymnal of 1871], with the single exception that on page 153 of that Journal we allowed and instructed the Committee to leave out eleven specified hymns, gave them permission to insert several, not specifying how many, although they read the first lines of thirty-one, I believe; and then the Committee were allowed to correct grammatical inaccuracies and rhetorical blemishes. This is absolutely all. I ask to be corrected if I am not in the right position. I ask it for this reason: I have been told by one or two members of this Convention that I made a great mistake when, after waiting two years and a half in all humility, supposing that the Committee would find out their error and retract it, I at last, under my signature, came out and published my statement in the *Missionary Record* of Charleston, and sent it to every member of that Committee, personally, hoping that they would take the initiative in what I considered the only right, proper, manly course. I trust I may not be seeming to reflect upon the conduct of this Committee any more than is absolutely necessary.

Now as to this matter of finality, I have but to refer to one thing. Something has been read from the remarks of Rev. Dr. Howe, who, at the last Convention, introduced the report on the Hymnal. He proposed that the Hymnal Committee should be continued to this the next General Convention; but he stated afterward that the purpose was simply to correct inaccuracies and blemishes, and nothing more. More than that, it was on the seventh or the ninth day of the session, I think, that he said this, and the action that I read from was on the sixteenth day of the session, page 153 of the Journal of the last General Convention. Re-

member that this was after a specified Tuesday, on which, at twelve o'clock, the liberty was denied members of the Convention to suggest any further alterations or improvements in the Hymnal. It is all fresh in the memory of the members of the last Convention. I was called upon to present my suggestions in writing, and I did it before that day to the Chairman. On that Tuesday the matter ended. I think I am right. On the sixteenth day of the session Dr. Howe brought in the report of the Joint Committee on the Hymnal, and he asked liberty to omit eleven hymns, to insert several, and stated that the work had disclosed some literary blemishes and errors of typography and so on. The Committee recommended the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That this report be adopted, and the Committee be instructed to amend the Hymnal accordingly."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Will the gentleman read also from the 76th page, in the message from the House of Bishops, the resolution that the Committee on Hymnal should be continued? With that message we concurred.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. This was on the ninth day of the session.

"Resolved, that the Committee on the Hymnody of the Church shall be continued, with instructions to make such alterations in the text of the Hymnal now adopted, as may be needed in order to secure accuracy and literary completeness."

I am willing to grant all that. That is just what I stated before. Now to confirm my position I turn to another place. On page 156 of the Journal of the last Convention we had a Joint Committee of conference in regard to the matter of the royalty. It seems that Committee reported to both Houses; and while we were in consideration of it, a message came down from the House of Bishops differing from the exact resolution reported in the House of Deputies by only one word, and I think that that can hardly be interpreted to have much weight:

"Resolved, That this Hymnal, *when* finally corrected by the Committee thereon, shall be free to be printed and published by all responsible publishers."

They were to correct it only on points of accuracy and the removal of certain literary blemishes. On page 156, the same resolution, reported from the same Joint Committee, has one word that I think is exceedingly significant:

"Resolved (the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurring), That the Hymnal, *now* finally corrected by the Committee thereon, shall be free to be printed and published by all responsible publishers."

Now I do not know but I think that the difference between "when" and "now" was a mere mistake of a word expressing the idea of the whole Joint Committee and of the Convention.

Now I want to adduce with all due respect certain plain words:

"It is hereby certified—"

This I read from the third page of the Hymnal, revised edition; it is the same also in the Hymnal that has been published.

"It is hereby certified that this is a true and accurate edition of the Hymnal thus adopted."

A strong certificate! When I allowed myself, two weeks ago, to be limited to five minutes, I barely touched upon the points of difference. I would be willing, if it were necessary, as I said then, to stand here one hour and read from this published book, hymns that cannot, by any possibility, be said to be different from those adopted in the Hymnal of the Convention on the ground of mere mistake, as the

gentleman from Long Island said this morning. The changes in the hymn which was read by the Deputy from Central Pennsylvania could not have been made by mere mistake. The variations in the very first hymn in this book could not possibly have been brought about by mistake—one whole stanza omitted; two stanzas put in; the word "God" changed to "Christ;" and now this Committee, in their last final act of agreement, propose to change the last line of the first verse to an entirely different reading. I hope the Committee will be discharged, or we shall have more revisions flying in upon us.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I hope he will be allowed to be heard further. He has this matter very much at heart. He feels that there is something to be said, and I think the Committee desires him to have all the time he wants. He ought certainly to have five or ten minutes more.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I understand he is here to prove that there have been fifteen hundred changes unauthorizedly made, and I move that he have sufficient time. I move that he have half an hour for that purpose.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that the gentleman from Georgia have ten minutes more.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. I will briefly call the attention of the Convention to the changes wrought in the very first hymn of the Hymnal, and here I will also say that it is almost precisely in the revision as in the Hymnal printed two and a half years ago. As I remarked two weeks ago, the order of the hymns has been changed, and I shall have to read from hymn No. 6, instead of hymn No. 1. For some reason or other, I suppose to accommodate some theory of music, or in order to compress, as the Committee say, certain matters, this Hymnal begins, as the Gospel begins, with the preparation for the First Advent. The hymnal printed begins with the Last Judgment. I do not know how it is that this change has been brought about. I will read from the Hymnal adopted by the Convention:

"Lo! He comes in clouds descending,
Once for favored sinners slain;
Thousand thousand saints attending
Swell the triumph of His train:
Alleluia!
Christ appears on earth again."

"Every eye shall now behold Him
Robed in dreadful majesty;
They who set at naught and sold Him,
Pierced and nail'd Him to the tree,
Deeply wailing,
Shall the true Messiah see."

Here comes the change:

"Those dear tokens of his Passion
Still his dazzling body bears;
Cause of endless exultation
To his ransomed worshippers;
With what rapture
Gaze we on those glorious scars!"

Then you skip two stanzas and come to:

"Yea, amen, let all adore Thee,
High on Thine eternal throne;
Saviour, take the power and glory;
Claim the kingdoms for Thine own:
O come quickly!
Alleluia! Amen!"

Now, permit me to say that there are fifty-seven hymns in this book adopted by the Convention which are reproduced in this new book with one or

more verses added, or one or more verses left out, and, in one case, seven stanzas left out. Most of these hymns as they stand in the book printed, with only four or five exceptions, stand precisely so in this book that is now called the revised Hymnal. Twenty-nine hymns in this book differ by variations in words that exceed one line; eight only are corrected in this book. There are, then, a large number of hymns, I think something like seventy, printed in this book, which differ from the book adopted, by changes of words less than a line. I have not time to read them—I would be perfectly willing to do it if time allowed. Most of these are reproduced in this Hymnal.

Now, the point I make is simply this, and I do it in all modesty; I do it, as I think, as simply a defender of the right, a defender of the dignity and authority of this House; when a committed trust is assigned to any body of gentleman, is it not properly to be expected that it will be executed strictly according to the letter? Consequently when we find in the report presented to us all this slurred over, as if it were simply a mistake, or, as in one place, a statement that the Committee ask leave to acknowledge two mistakes that have been made, because for reasons partly personal, and partly from the distance which separated them, they could not state explicitly, etc. Is it quite the thing for that Committee to slide over such deviations, not mistakes—such purposed and designed deviations as I have referred to? I think it is a very important thing that this Hymnal should not certainly be made a finality. I will at the proper time offer a resolution to this effect.

“Resolved, That the Hymnal be published in accordance with the resolution on page 153 of the Journal of 1871, and that this instruction be carried out by a special committee of two, one clergyman and one layman.”

I have now to say in regard to this Revised Hymnal that comes before us, we have here in connection with this revised Hymnal about seventy changes, as the Committee themselves say, from this printed book. They say in some places they have made substitutions. By what authority? Is that a mistake? By what authority do they drop from the Hymnal of 1871 and insert in this new Hymnal? I do not quite understand it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Convention has nothing to do with the revised Hymnal until it is adopted.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. Then I say that I object to the adoption of this Hymnal, which will cause hundreds of congregations who have adopted the Hymnal agreed to in 1871 very considerable inconvenience. For instance, if you will turn to the 430th hymn of the Hymnal that is revised or adopted—I care not which—you will find that that hymn which is in the Hymnal printed, is an entirely different hymn, almost in no respect like that adopted, except in the general current of thought and in the rhyme; you will find that they have changed all that again in the Hymnal adopted; but the very next hymn, the 431st hymn, “Round the Lord in glory seated,” they have allowed to remain just as it is. There are many cases of this sort, where one hymn follows another, where one hymn conforms to the Hymnal adopted three years ago, and the next hymn following, or a few hymns following, differs in such important respects as the first hymn differs as I have shown you.

Now this Hymnal that is reported to us as a revised edition has twenty-five hymns in it—I think they propose to make it twenty-six or twenty-seven—which are not in the Hymnal that has been used in many congregations for two years or two and

a-half. They have dropped out fourteen hymns, I think, and in their places inserted other hymns, some of them new, some of them old Prayer-Book hymns or psalms. They have, then, added at the end eleven hymns; “Rock of Ages” is printed twice; “Guide me, O Thou Great Jehovah,” is printed twice; and they propose to print twice the hymn “Jesus, Saviour of my Soul,” printed in one place “Jesus, Lover of my Soul.”

I really think that the adoption of this Hymnal will cause almost all congregations who have used the other the necessity of abandoning those books and purchasing this alone. Perhaps it will help the royalty, and it may be that that is a consideration, but I think it is hardly the thing for the congregations themselves.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a few inaccuracies in the proposed Hymnal, and I do it for the purpose of illustrating the propriety of the argument of referring back the proposed Hymnal to the Committee who have revised it, and indeed the necessity of that course. The alterations that are suggested upon the piece of paper which the Committee have submitted to us as having been made to the Hymnal, have not in all cases been made. There are slight inaccuracies still. As the Convention is supposed to act on these proposed changes, it should act advisedly, and therefore it seems to me that the resolution proposed by the Committee itself should be put in such form that, instead of being discharged, the Committee should be continued in order to make the changes actually which are reported on this sheet of paper as having been made.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Allow me to say that the Committee has been discharged by the House of Bishops, and there is only in this House one member of it, and he is a layman. You will have to make a new committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. It seems to me that it is eminently proper that the gentlemen who have heretofore acted on this Committee should act again. If we have a new committee, we shall have a new Hymnal. Perhaps every one in this House would suggest amendments that he could make to one of the five hundred hymns, and so we should have at least two hundred or three hundred alterations. You must adopt something which in the opinion of a wise and sensible committee is about right. Therefore, adopting the suggestion of the gentleman from Long Island, at the proper time I shall move that the matter be referred back to the Committee to make such alterations as they have designed to make and no others, and that the vacancies in the Committee be filled up.

Now, to illustrate: In hymn No. 87 it is proposed to change “now” for “once,” and “yet” for “yes.” That has already been done, I find, so that it is a mere inaccuracy in the original print. So it is with the changes in Nos. 97 and 98. In hymn No. 103 the letter “h” is to be dropped from “Hallelujah,” but that is insufficient, because the “j” should also be converted into an “i.” In hymn No. 176, the word “triumphant” should be “and triumph,” and also “ascents of heaven” should be substituted for “dizzy steep of heaven”; but in the revised book I find that it is printed “ascend,” in the singular, instead of “ascents.”

In Hymn 205 a verse is actually omitted and no note is taken of it in the alterations. I will not take up time. There are at least twenty alterations which are not yet noted and should be. This is all I have to say on that point.

The learned and eloquent Deputy from Wisconsin has repeated a legal proposition which, if I remember aright, he and I once contested a few years ago, that a resolution adopted by the two Houses of the

General Convention is not law for the clergy. I assure the gentleman—and I think I shall be sustained by the parliamentary members of this House—that a resolution is a law, and that the Presbyters at least, if not the laymen, of the Church, are obliged to obey the laws of the Church. It is an error which has crept among the Presbyters, and it was brought up some years ago in discussing a question whether the resolution, adopted by the General Convention in 1868, relating to Ritual, was a law of the Church. I remember that the question was discussed in Congress some years ago whether or not a resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives was a law. If I mistake not—and if I am I shall be corrected by a gentleman better informed—they appointed a committee, and the two Houses adopted the conclusion of that committee that the action of the two Houses, whether by resolution or by enactment, was the will of the two Houses in Congress assembled and must be obeyed. It may be that as a resolution of this House does not provide a penalty for its violation, a Presbyterian may not be subject to punishment for the disobeying of a resolution, but if he desires to obey the General Convention or any enactment of the General Convention, he is to obey a resolution as well as a Canon.

Rev. Dr. ANDERSON, of Virginia. Mr. President, with regard to this question of finality it is not competent for this House to make a finality on any such subject. We cannot bind future Conventions. They may take it up hereafter, and all our doings hitherto will be liable to be reconsidered. I think that point therefore is disposed of.

The next point is in regard to the various criticisms that have been passed on this book. There have been some able criticisms that I have read with great interest from many of my brethren; but I say here that the larger part of them has been made by theological students and women and boys, and that I consider them of no value.

So likewise about this being a thankless office. I with many of my clerical and lay friends here thank the Committee for their work in this matter. It is not a thankless work by any manner of means, quite the reverse.

So likewise in regard to these corrections. I am aware that they may be made, but that we are to wait until we get a resolution of all these questions is impossible. We shall never have a Hymnal at all if we do that. I do not expect to have my views carried out, but I have examined this matter with very great care, and I am prepared to say, from my knowledge and consulting with a great number of people, that I believe this book to be the best extant, and I do not believe there are five men in this House who can get up and say that they can put their hand on any one book equal to this which is now submitted to our consideration. Therefore, I think all we have to do now is to authorize the use of this book, and prohibit, by Canon, the use of all books not authorized by this Church. That seems to me quite sufficient. As to the errors which have been pointed out by the gentleman from New York, I think it is a very reasonable proposition that they should be corrected, and I doubt not the Committee will consent to take that matter in hand, and to make those few corrections, and we can pass upon them, if it is done by that authority, before this Convention adjourns.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. Mr. President, I rise to say that I shall not support this Hymnal as a finality; the reasons I need not adduce, for they have already been given. The fact of the many inaccuracies which have been stated is quite sufficient.

I believe our hymns will continue to grow to the

end of time, just as they have been growing in our collection for the last three thousand five hundred years. The Psalms from 90 to 100 are attributed to Moses. Lightfoot says he wrote Psalm 98 in Egypt. That gives us a date of one thousand five hundred years before Christ. Then, if we look at the Psalms further on, we shall see that the Psalm commencing with the words,

"By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down,"

brings us to the year 518 B.C., when the Temple service was restored. In the interval, we find a Psalm composed on the ascension of the Ark from the house of Obbedom to Mount Zion, under David, about the year 1040 B.C. I mention these as illustrations of how the sacred poetry of the Hebrews grew. Now let us come down to our own Church and our own time. We have in the old Prayer-Book, I think, about 32 hymns first set forth by the General Convention and authorized to be used in the churches. We decided that that collection was not a finality, for we increased the number to 212. Then again, in still later times, and very near the present, we authorized, I think, in 1865, 60 additional hymns, making the number about 270. Then, at the last General Convention, we put forth this Hymnal, increasing the number to over 500 hymns.

There are many of these hymns in the Hymnal that I think are weak and unnecessary, and that this Committee should sit perpetually, should be a continuous committee, should revise the hymns and suggest what should be dropped, and continue to enrich the Hymnal with all the additions that may be made in the way of sacred poetry from time to time, and all the corrections that may be necessary, I hope that the same Committee will be continued, the vacancies being filled in it.

This is all I have to say as the reason why I shall vote against this Hymnal being a finality.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the Hymnal, and it would be very unnecessary after the remarks of my friend from Wisconsin; but I rise to call the attention of this House to a proposition announced by that learned and distinguished gentleman, whom we all hold in so much respect, and that is that a joint resolution of the two Houses has not the effect of law. Now, sir, I venture to offer my small contribution by way of opinion in this House, and in doing this I feel that I am supported by several other gentlemen of the legal profession. I think that a joint resolution of the two Houses has the force of law, as much so as a Canon; and, if I remember rightly, one of the most important acts of the Congress of the United States, which has had a more important bearing upon the destiny of this country than any other in my time, was passed by joint resolution. I mean the admission of Texas into this Union. It is certainly a novel proposition to me that a joint resolution of the two Houses cannot have the force of law. I think it is important that this question should be met, so that we may understand that when we again pass a joint resolution we mean thereby to bind all those who come within the power of the law of this body.

In reference to the Hymnal and the question of finality, I do not think there is anything final in this world until the final judgment. We certainly have no right to bind future conventions. But I suppose the only question here is this, whether we shall continue the Joint Commission with a view of amending from time to time our Hymnal. I do hope that the Church is wiser than that, and that the very resolutions sent down by the House of Bishops will be adopted. I cannot imagine what else we can do, if we do anything at all.

On the subject of the joint resolutions my learned

legal friend from Western New York (Mr. Smith) desires me to call the attention of this Convention to the fact that the ratification of the Book of Common Prayer was by joint resolution. I hold, therefore, that if it is referred to the legal gentlemen they will be quite unanimous that a joint resolution has the force of law.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, touching the point referred to by the gentleman from Virginia last, we find that everything, not only in the Book of Common Prayer, but the Articles of Religion, all the special orders, the services for the consecration of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are set forth by joint resolution. That would seem to settle the legal question touching that point, so that even clerics can have no further doubt upon it.

Sir, it seems to me after all the consideration we have had of this subject, that the sooner we come to the end of it the better. For nine years I think this matter of the Hymnal has been before the Church, floating about, receiving here one proposition and there another, according to the complexion or variety of men's minds, and nobody has been satisfied. I would rather have a bold approval of the Hymnal at once, though I never expect to see a Hymnal acceptable to all if I should live till doomsday. "As many critics as men," we may safely say—and every man feels competent to criticise—and those criticisms will be founded upon principles to which others will not agree. We find some starting on a personal ground that a hymn should be precisely thus and so, modelled and shaped precisely after one given classical or approved pattern, and anything apart from that must be deemed erroneous and undesirable. Accordingly some hymns are here on that model.

Then again, subjective hymns are by some critics condemned. I have read an article in the *Church Review* entitled "Unreality of Hymns," and throughout the unreality was made to consist in the amount of spiritual quality and import there was in a hymn. It said that a communicant must not lament before God for his sins, for he is entitled to go to the baptismal register and see that his name is there, and that he is a regenerated child of God. That is the character of it all through. You must never bring in anything subjective, because everything subjective is personal, belonging to the first person, and that can by no means be brought into a congregation, which implies a collective person.

One would think that that writer—I only mention him as a single critic by way of illustration—would find it difficult to repeat the General Confession. I do not know how he could repeat humbly the Confession before God in the Communion Service. I do not know how he could repeat the last versicle of the *Te Deum*. That sort of criticism, however, has its effect on men's minds and influences their decision. It grows from the character of the mind, it grows from the character of each man's religious experience, and each is apt to have an opinion at variance with that of other men. Now if we expect to have unity in our principle, or uniformity in our decision, we shall be utterly mistaken.

I might refer to the criticisms that have been made on Bishop Heber's great Communion hymn, and many other hymns containing figurative expressions. Dr. Beecher is said to have remarked that Bishop Heber could not have been a converted man, for he had no spiritual-mindedness about him! Be that as it may, you will find him a most exquisite religious poet; but if you call his poetry Christian poetry always, I think you will find yourself much mistaken. That would be a misnomer. The man wrote according to the nature of his mind and

character, and yet the production of his mind and character might not be congenial to the intellectual tastes and tendencies of another man's mind and character.

I might give many illustrations how the most beautiful and happy things have been criticised, and I refer to it simply as showing the extreme difficulty, if not impracticability, of our finding a uniform assent to any Hymnal that we may create or produce. Hence, sir, in sheer hopelessness of anything better, I for one am in favor of a finality so far as this Convention can make a thing final. I would give the go-by to all royalties and everything else. I desire to see our Church established as a fixity in all her relations, but I would give plenty of verge and scope within all proper limits. Having deliberated, as we have done, on this question for nine years, having determined what is the proper range in the use of a Hymnal, I would now adopt this. I feel very sure that although this book cannot be pronounced perfect by any man, yet no man familiar with a Hymnal will say, without a great deal of thought, that there is any better Hymnal in the language than is comprised in this book. It is vain to expect to find five hundred perfect pieces of poetry in the English tongue. Therefore let us take what we have before us. There are hymns here that suit the humble spiritual mind, knowing nothing of theology and nothing of religion but a supreme consciousness of a love to Christ, and that experience shall find familiar vent in some of these hymns; while the most classically bred, the better taught, the most æsthetic Christian will just set those hymns aside as altogether unsuited to him.

So, again—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I rise simply to move that the vote be taken on this question on or before the hour of half-past one o'clock.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the question be taken upon the resolutions with regard to the Hymnal on or before half-past one.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President and gentlemen, with regard to the matter of this Hymnal, I have just a few words to say. Any man who looks over the religious world at this time of day will see that while liturgies are important and desirable, yet the most important agency in spreading new, strange and doubtful doctrine is Hymnals. Take the Methodists and see how they went out from the Church of England in doctrine by the Methodist Hymnals. See how the friends of Oliver Cromwell were put into frenzy by a Calvinistic version of the Psalms, and you see at this day every sect and denomination impelled by this liturgical music. I have only sixty of these new hymns. A friend of mine has about three hundred. They spawn upon the world like the frogs of Egypt.

I do not say that this Hymnal is the best that we can have, but I do say that you and I, and every man who loves the truth of the Gospel, should be careful with regard to the propagation of new and strange doctrines. I say this Hymnal is not the best in the world, but I say it has come down from the Bishops of our Church, and from a committee whom I can trust in point of doctrine, and, therefore, while I do not accept it as a finality, I am perfectly satisfied with the selection of hymns which these gentlemen have given us. I believe there will be no strange doctrine propagated by it. If you permit free hymn-singing, then you have the peculiar doctrines of Henry Ward Beecher capable of being sung in this Church, you have the old Calvinistic hymns capable of being

sung, and you have the new Ritualistic hymns, of which there are some very near to Popery, capable of being sung. By this idea of unlimited hymn singing, we place every clergyman in this Church in the position of a propagator of his own peculiar notions. The effect of this will be to appoint you and me and everybody else as a gentleman whose business is first to preach his particular notions in the sermon, and then have a free hymn singing left before him to select the hymn which the choir is to sing, and in which his people are to unite. That is a sort of operation I do not want to see established in this Church of ours, for I do think it is time to keep up and maintain the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church as in our Prayer-Book—our services, our offices, our Articles—it is established, and is binding upon me and every other clergyman in this Church who is an honest man.

Now, Mr. President, although this Hymnal is weak in the legs, although I conceive that making 1,500 changes in that Hymnal is an unauthorized procedure, still at the same time I must say that every clergyman and layman in this Convention who wishes peace, and who wishes the protection of the doctrine which we have received from our fathers and from the Church of England, and which we believe will yet be accepted by every one in this Church—I think every one of us is bound to accept this Hymnal as it comes down to us from the House of Bishops, hoping that in time we shall get something better.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Mr. President, I will not detain you long. In the main I agree entirely with the sentiment which has been expressed that it is better we should come as rapidly as possible to a conclusion in this matter. The Church is certainly standing at a disadvantage with the prospect perpetually before her of change in her hymnology. I heartily coincide, therefore, with the wish that has been expressed in that direction.

But there is one matter about which I am not satisfied. It is of much smaller consequence than some to which reference has been made, but still it is of sufficient consequence, it seems to me, to detain the action of this Committee for a little. I have reference to the arrangement of the Gloria Patrias at the end. I have found practically, and I believe it has been the experience of all who have made use of the Hymnal, that it is very difficult indeed to find the Gloria Patria, which is appropriate to any hymn we use. This has to be found suddenly, and it is almost impossible at any time to turn to it. It is a perfect thicket in which it is almost impossible to find our way, without having deliberately examined it beforehand. It is often the case that the Gloria Patria is sung by the choir and almost concluded before the minister and congregation find out what they are singing. I submit, therefore, that in this respect the Hymnal should be recommit- ted in order that this part of it may be perfected. I would like to have seen other things in the Hymnal, and yet I suppose I am like others in that respect. I cannot see why that glorious hymn we had in our hymn-book, "Eternal source of every joy," should have been left out. It is appropriate to a particular time of the year, and I could see no reason for omitting it. A few minutes ago, however, a reason was suggested to me as perhaps to be found in the opening words of the last verse,

"Here, in Thy house, let incense rise."

that may account for the omission of that. [Laughter.]

Reference has been made to the one living writer of hymns in our Church—Dr. Muhlenburg. I am

sorry that we have not more of the productions of his poetic spirit; for instance, one like this:

"Since o'er thy footstool here below
Such radiant gems are strewn,
O what magnificence must glow,
My God, above Thy throne!
So brilliant here these drops of light;
There the full ocean rolls how bright!

"If night's blue curtain of the sky,
With a thousand stars inwrought,
Hang like a royal canopy
With glittering diamonds fraught,
Be, Lord, Thy temple's outer veil,
What splendor at the shrine must dwell

"The dazzling sun at noontide hour,
Forth from his flaming vase
Flinging o'er earth the golden shower
Till vale and mountain blaze,
But shows, O Lord, are beams of Thine—
What then the day where Thou dost shin

"Oh! how shall these dim eyes endure
That noon of living rays,
Or how my spirit so impure
Upon Thy brightness gaze?
Anoint, O Lord, anoint my sight,
And robe me for that world of light."

I submit, if any alterations, amendments, or additions are to be made, a hymn like this might profitably be introduced, and so, too, the one to which I have just referred. I am, however, in the main satisfied with the work of the Committee. I would be glad if we could come to an end of this question. I am thankful to them for what they have done, but so far as the arrangement of the Gloria Patrias is concerned, I submit it is almost a necessity that that part of the work should be improved.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I am decidedly opposed to accepting this revised Hymnal as a finality, and I am equally opposed to accepting it temporarily. While we thank and honor the Committee on the Hymnal for their labor, I feel that this House is not yet in a condition to accept as a finality what shall be for future years the Hymnal of this Church.

I have gone over the revised Hymnal very carefully and very thoroughly, but because I have made up my mind that the temper of this House is against receiving criticisms upon the work of the Committee, I shall confine myself to one criticism only, and allow me to say it is a criticism far more serious, far more important than any of those that were alluded to by the Reverend Deputy from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Vinton). I call attention to one of the hymns newly added, namely, the 526th. It is a hymn upon death, and the second stanza reads thus:

"O Prince of Life! I know
That when I too lie low,
Thou wilt at last my soul from death awaken."

Now, gentlemen, if that last line means anything, it means, to my mind, that the souls of men after death are in a state of unconscious sleep. I am not aware that there are men in this Church who believe and who teach that there is no future immortality of the soul, and who believe that the souls of the wicked at death do pass into a state of unconscious sleep; but mark, this is a hymn about to be appointed to be sung by Christian men; men who have professed their belief in the immortality of the soul; and, therefore, I say this one criticism of itself should, it seems to me, prevent this Convention from accepting this revised Hymnal as a finality. I am equally opposed to accepting it

as a temporary expedient. It is unwise, it is unsafe for us to be accepting these temporary expedients, making changes Convention after Convention, modelling, changing, whittling, working over our hymns time after time, until in the end there will be such a confusion in the minds of worshippers that they will not know what the hymn really means.

Suppose this revised edition is accepted temporarily for three years longer. I shall have in my congregation twenty-five, thirty, or fifty worshippers who will wish to procure a new Hymn Book, and they will very naturally purchase the revised edition, and I shall have one part of my congregation singing a Hymn this way and another part singing the same hymn another way. There will be, let me tell you, more confusion in our churches than there was in the Church of Corinth, to which St. Paul alludes when he complains of one singing one song and another singing another, of one speaking in one voice and another in another.

I do beg you, gentlemen of the Convention, to hesitate before you accept this Hymnal as a finality, and also before you accept this revised edition which has been brought before this House. My humble opinion is, and I express it with all deference, that it would be far better for us to keep the Hymnal that was reported to the last General Convention, defective as it is; and let the Hymnal Committee continue, or appoint another, so that in the end, when the Church is ready to accept the Hymnal that it needs, and that is worthy of the Church, we shall have one that each and every member of this Convention, or of the Conventions that are to follow, can use without hesitation, and without any fear whatever.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I rise for the purpose of offering a resolution, and I will simply supplement the resolution with one remark. I have come to the conclusion that it is

"Better to bear the ills we have,
Than fly to others we know not of."

I am therefore contented for another three years to adhere to that which we have. I would wish, however, that a Committee—a new Committee, of course, the old Committee is now discharged—should be appointed to take into consideration the whole subject of the Hymnal and report to us at the next General Convention. The House may not be willing then to accept it, but it is far better to take the five hundred and twenty hymns we now have, and which are widely spread in our congregations, than to adopt this little revision concerning which we have heard so much said. It is really a mountain in labor bringing forth a mouse. I rise, therefore, for the purpose of offering the following resolutions as a substitute for what is before the House:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Hymnal as now in use be continued without alteration until the next General Convention.

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Committee, consisting of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen, be appointed to consider the subject of the Hymnal, and to report to the next General Convention."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The criticism that has been made upon the hymns, it seems to me, must be a very critical one, and at the same time I am very glad it is made with so much earnestness by my brother, because it simply shows the character of the criticism to which the Hymnal has subjected,

"O Prince of Life! I know
That when I too lie low,
Thou wilt at last my soul from death awaken."

He objects, it appears, to the doctrine as to the

immortality of the soul, not remembering our Saviour said, "Our friend Lazareth sleepeth." They are not all asleep. The word "sleep," rest, a state and condition of the departed, certainly is so far recognized in the New Testament that a poet may use it in a hymn, and people not very critical may sing it without disturbance of mind.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the 190th hymn in the Prayer-Book is open to the same objection:

"And man, when in the grave,
Can never quit its gloom,
Until th' eternal morn shall wake
The slumber of the tomb."

The Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Of course, but that was not very bad in the Prayer-Book.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut. I call attention to the fact that in the 526th hymn it is the soul that sleeps; in Lazarus it was the body that slept.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Connecticut. Oh, very well. In the last Convention, on the 9th day, the Hymnal Committee were continued to secure accuracy and literary completeness. I want simply to make this point, that the gentleman from Georgia mistook my word "mistake." I referred to minor matters. I do not know whether the minor matters were all mistakes or not, the others were. But there was "literary completeness," and the Committee certainly understood that they were entrusted with that task.

The point in regard to the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I would make, respectfully, is this: According to the amendment that he offers to us, the Hymnal is to be bound up with the Prayer-Book.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. It "may" be bound with it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. It may be bound up with the Prayer-Book. Does not that destroy at once the adjustment with the publishers concerning the royalty on the Hymnal? Can any one in his own mind guess exactly how that is affected? This certainly is a matter very solemnly and seriously to be considered, and therefore we are not prepared to act upon that. I admire very many of the points of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and they have been very wisely and carefully planned; but we are not prepared for this, nor shall we be, I think, at another Convention.

It seems to me the objection to the substitute of my friend from Connecticut is very plain. After three years of the trial to which this Hymnal has been exposed, after these revisions that have been considered as acceptable very largely, and have been received from a vast number of writers—I am told that the correspondence is almost infinite on the subject; there certainly have been very many communications in the papers—if these revisions are completed, we had better take them now; otherwise this thing may again occur. In the last few months, the last quarter, the receipts on the royalty have fallen off fearfully. Why? Because there was a doubt in the minds of our people undermining the whole thing, and the Church is afraid to buy the Hymnal. Now you have a revision presented to you to-day which can be brought in place for less than \$100, and it will not disturb congregations so fearfully. There are very few points where a congregation in singing these hymns would be very much disturbed. I do not think any congregation will find fault with a choir or rector for any disturbance that may occur. It seems to me if we have this revision we have a security against that danger in the last year before the next

Convention when the same thing will come up probably again and the royalty will be again diminished; and I remind gentlemen that the royalty is a most precious charity; that it is carrying comfort to the broken-down clergymen that this Church has no other way to reach. It is a comfort to him as he lays his head on his last pillow to remember that there is some little pittance provided by his brethren for those near and dear to him. It seems to me worthy the cause that we should guard this revision against that danger from again occurring in the last year preceding the next Convention.

In order to put the whole thing before the mind of the Convention, allow me to read my resolutions. In the first place, we move to discharge the Committee. To that, of course, I presume there is no objection. They discharge themselves. They do not belong here and we cannot do anything with them. Then,

"Resolved, That this House concur in Message No. 32 of the House of Bishops."

Which is a resolution appointing this Hymnal to be used, not all Hymnals, not Plymouth Church, or anything else. Then this is an expression of the opinion of this House that this does not prevent gentlemen from offering matters of reconsideration in another Convention, and, above all, remember that it merely leaves the revised Hymnal for the next Convention to consider exactly as any other question. And then comes the next resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Hymnal now revised and adopted is free to be printed and published by all responsible publishers who shall obtain a license to that effect from the Trustees of the Fund for the relief of widows and orphans of deceased clergy, and of aged and infirm and disabled clergymen, and who shall assume to such trustees a payment to be applied for the uses of said fund equivalent to ten per cent. upon the retail selling price; and that the copyright of the revised Hymnal shall vest in said Trustees, subject to the further order of this Convention."

"Also, that the Trustees be authorized to superintend the revision and publication of the revised editions of the Hymnal, with power to make the typographical and literary changes necessary to conform it to the committee's report made to this Convention."

Which, of course, as I am standing here for them, means these corrections that have been offered upon sheets.

It seems to me that that leaves the Hymnal on better ground than the resolution of my friend from Connecticut, because it staves off the possibility of the diminishing of the sale of the Hymnal and doubt being infused into the mind of the Church in the year before the next General Convention.

The objection I make to the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that we cannot at this moment arrange, as we stand ready to take the question, exactly how this Hymnal is to be bound up with the Prayer-Book, and see that the rights of those who have purchased the copyright have been preserved.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask a question.

The PRESIDENT. The time has come to take the vote.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. I would like to understand whether we are to vote for this Hymnal now as a finality, or whether it is put off until the next General Convention?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The first resolution is to discharge the Committee; the second is to concur with the House of Bishops. The third resolution is that this is not a finality, but it shall be

the Hymnal of the Church. The fourth is to commit the matter of royalty to the Trustees.

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. If it is not a finality, but merely a revision of the former Hymnal, I can vote for it.

The PRESIDENT. As I understand the matter, the motion is first to discharge the Committee of this House from the further consideration of the subject, and there is only one member of the Committee left here. The next motion is to agree with the message of the House of Bishops with sundry amendments. These amendments, offered by Dr. Hall, come in as an amendment to the message from the House of Bishops. Then the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Huntington) is an amendment to that amendment, and, finally, the resolution offered by Dr. Mead, of Connecticut, is a substitute for the whole. The question is first on the substitute proposed by Dr. Mead.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I ask for a separation of his resolution.

The PRESIDENT. That will be done, as a matter of course. The question is on the first resolution of Dr. Mead, which is—

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Hymnal, as now in use, be continued without alteration until the next General Convention."

The resolution was not agreed to, there being, on a division, ayes 90, noes 102.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Of course the second resolution is considered as withdrawn?

The PRESIDENT. Upon the second it is not necessary to put the question.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia. I offer a substitute for the matter before us:

"Resolved, That the Hymnal be published in accordance with resolutions on page 153 of the Journal of 1871, to be carried out by a Special Committee of two, one clergyman and one layman."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute just offered.

The substitute was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Huntington) by way of amendment.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I would accept that proposition with a single amendment, to omit the words "and bound up with the Book of Common Prayer." That would remove one serious objection.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I will ask the Secretary to strike out those words.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I ask the mover if he will admit another amendment, to add after the words "1832" the words "and 1865," so as to include the Additional Hymns.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. No, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I ask permission to suggest an amendment which I think will be accepted by the gentleman. It is after the clause which provides that the Hymnal shall be put into possession of the trustees of that charitable society, to add, "subject to the further order of this Convention."

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I accept the amendment of the Deputy from New York.

Rev. Dr. ELLIOTT, of South Carolina. I would like to ask a question with regard to the word "finality." That is a point that I think will determine a good many votes. I should like to know whether it is to be considered a finality.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. It is only a finality so far as any Convention can make it so. If I may be allowed, I will accept the amend-

ment of my colleague from Massachusetts (Rev. Dr. Burgess), which includes the hymns authorized in 1865, the Additional Hymns so-called.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I would like to call attention to the fact, for the information of the House, that this resolution has done all that it is possible to do to give a character of finality to the present revised Hymnal.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would like to call attention to another point, that the "Hymns Ancient and Modern" may fairly be claimed to come in also on the list, and therefore your Hymnal would amount to nothing. If you commence letting these things in you have lost your entire work.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman from Long Island, that I have not been permitted by the House to make that amendment letting in the Additional Hymns. I asked for permission, and I now withdraw the request. I ask the Secretary to read the resolution as amended by those amendments I have accepted.

The SECRETARY. It is as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That in place of the certificate and attestation printed on the third page of the revised edition of the Hymnal, the following authentication, duly certified by the proper officers, be substituted, viz.: 'By the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in General Convention, in the year of our Lord 1874, this Revised Hymnal is set forth and allowed to be used in all congregations of the said Church.'"

—leaving out the words "and to be bound with the Book of Common Prayer."

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of Connecticut. There is perfect confusion in this House, and I move that the amendment be laid on the table that we may come at once to the report of the Committee.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Is not that out of order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. The reading cannot be stopped, and the Secretary will proceed.

The SECRETARY continued the reading as follows:

"This Hymnal, as now revised, is free to be printed and published by all responsible publishers who shall obtain a license to that effect from the Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen, and of aged, infirm, and disabled Clergymen, who shall assure to such trustees a payment, to be applied to the uses of said fund, equivalent to ten per cent. upon the retail selling price, and that the copyright of the Hymnal shall vest in the said Trustees, subject to the further order of the General Convention. No hymns other than those contained in this Hymnal may lawfully be used in the public worship of this Church, save that it shall be lawful to use the Selections and Psalms in metre, or hymns set forth in 1893, as well as the Hymnal set forth in 1871, until order to the contrary shall have been taken by the General Convention."

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. If that is put on, what is to be done with the hymns in the Prayer-Book now?

The PRESIDENT. I do not know, sir.

The SECRETARY continued the reading of the amendment, as follows:

"But note that anthems in the words of the Holy Scripture or in the Book of Common Prayer may at any time be used instead of hymns.

"Resolved, That to the sentence on the fourth page of the revised Hymnal be appended the words, 'From the joint resolution of the General Convention of 1892.'"

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I suggest that the House is not in a state to vote intelligently upon this question, and that the matter be postponed until after the recess. ["No, No!"]

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I move to lay the amendment or substitute of the Deputy from Massachusetts on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The question has been ordered, and that motion is only made to stop debate. It is only another mode of disposing of the subject, which would be disposed of just as effectively by taking the vote directly upon the main proposition.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. Very well; I withdraw my motion.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I would ask—and I know I ask what the House want to know—that some gentleman will call attention to the essential differences between the propositions now pending, before the vote is taken.

The PRESIDENT. I think it is generally understood. The question is on the amendment of Rev. Dr. Huntington.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT. The question now recurs upon the amendment proposed by Dr. Hall to the message from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The Clerical Deputation from the Diocese of Connecticut call for a vote by dioceses and orders. ["No, no!"] That will take time.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for recess has already passed, and it will now be taken.

The Convention thereupon took a recess for half an hour, and reassembled at two P.M., when the President resumed the Chair.

COURT OF APPEALS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island, submitted the following reports, which were placed on the calendar:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to which was referred the message of the House of Bishops No. 33, and several resolutions upon the subject of an Amendment to the Constitution to empower the General Convention to create a Court of Appeals, respectfully report that they have considered the subject, and while there was some difference of opinion, a decided majority deemed it inexpedient to make such amendment. Your Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That it is not expedient to amend the Constitution so as to authorize the General Convention to establish a Court of Appeals.

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the resolution of the House of Bishops in Message No. 33."

PARTS OF DIOCESES TO BE MISSIONARY DISTRICTS.

"The Committee on the Constitutional Amendments, to whom was referred a resolution regarding Article V., hereby respectfully present the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be recommended and proposed that the following addition be made to Article V., of the Constitution, to wit: Insert at the end of the Article the words, 'The General Convention may, upon the application of the Bishop and Convention of an organized Diocese, setting forth that the territory of the Diocese is too large for due Episcopal supervision by the Bishop of the Diocese, set off a portion of such Diocesan territory, which shall, thereupon, be placed within or constitute a missionary jurisdiction, or a part thereof, as the House of Bishops may determine.'"

SUPPLEMENTAL DEPUTIES.

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments

to whom was referred, by resolution of the House, the enquiry whether Supplementary Deputies can be entitled to seats in this House without an amendment of the Constitution, respectfully report:

"1. That by the terms of the Constitution this House is composed of Clerical and Lay Deputies from the several Dioceses to be chosen in the manner prescribed by the Conventions thereof. The Diocese, therefore, is the only authority which can confer the right to be a member. This House itself has no such authority. The so-called Deputies from Missionary Districts admitted to seats on the floor are not members in any constitutional sense.

"2. The office of Deputy, chosen by a Diocese, is a personal trust, incapable of delegation by him to another person unless he is authorized by the Convention of his Diocese to appoint his substitute. Nor can all the Deputies from a Diocese make such substitution in the absence of such authority.

"3. But the Convention of a Diocese, without change of Constitution, may choose alternate Deputies, or provide for substitution, or the filling of such vacancies in such manner as it deems proper. Any person claiming a seat in this House as a Deputy, with all the rights of membership, must have been chosen by the Diocesan Convention, or if he claims to fill a vacancy, he must derive and show his title under and through the action of such Diocesan Convention.

"The Committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

SHORTENED FORMS OF PRAYER.

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred a resolution asking a report upon the expediency of proposing an amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution, have had the same under consideration, and respectfully report the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following be proposed and made known to the several Dioceses as an Amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution, to be added at the end of the Article as it now stands, to wit, the words, 'Provided that the General Convention may, by Canon, arrange and set forth a shortened form of Morning and Evening Prayer, to be compiled wholly from the Book of Common Prayer; or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use.'

AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION.

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom were referred certain memorials and resolutions, with other accompanying documents, directing them to enquire into the expediency of instituting a commission to revise the Constitution of this Church, have had the same under consideration, and would beg leave to submit the following report:

"The Constitution of the Church was adopted in 1789, and the long period which has elapsed with comparatively so few and, for the most part, so unimportant amendments, strongly attests the wisdom and foresight of its founders.

"The powers of the General Convention have never been defined in that instrument. It would be a difficult task were it deemed a desirable one to define them by any written constitution. Under its present organic law, the Protestant Episcopal Church has increased, prospered, and become, under God's providence, a powerful organization and agency in the conversion of human souls. Alterations and amendments in the Constitution should never be proposed, except when shown to be demanded by the best interests of the Church, and not then till after full and mature deliberation. When such

exigencies shall arise, in the future, as in the past, your Committee are so persuaded any change can always be more safely and wisely done by specific amendments, than by committing the whole instrument for a revision to any commission. Your Committee believe that the specific amendment can be more fully discharged upon the floor of this House when its precise operation and intentment may be examined and modified, and where an enlightened, wise judgment upon the necessity of the proposed change can be more certainly reached. Whenever the necessities or wants of the Church are found in such antagonism with existing provisions and limitations of our fundamental law, the General Convention will soon become convinced of that fact by proposed amendments from the various dioceses in which a change is asked.

"It would be unwise to anticipate such changes or amendments in the Constitution until such a necessity is clearly manifest.

"Your Committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient at this time to institute any commission to revise and amend the Constitution of the Church.

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom was referred a resolution of the House directing said Committee to enquire whether there is anything that conflicts with the independence of the different Dioceses, or with the spirit of the Constitution of the Church, in a proposition requiring that in the trial of a minister for holding or teaching, publicly or privately, any doctrine contrary to that held by the Church, the consent or approval of two-thirds of the number of persons constituting the court of trial shall be necessary to a conviction, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report: The Constitution of the Church prescribes that the mode of trying Bishops shall be provided by the General Convention. The Court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of Bishops only. In every Diocese the mode of trying Presbyters and Deacons may be instituted by the Convention of that Diocese (Article VI. of the Constitution).

"The General Convention are empowered by this grant to prescribe the mode and manner of the trial of a Bishop by a Court of Bishops. Accordingly, the Canon prescribing the trial of Bishops directs that, at every presentment of a Bishop for alleged erroneous doctrines, the Court shall be composed of all the Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, except the accuser and the accused. Three-fourths of such Bishops shall constitute a quorum, but the consent of two-thirds of all the Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops shall be necessary to a conviction. (Can. 9, Tit. II., Sec. 7.) But it will be perceived that in the case of the trial of a Presbyter or Deacon for teaching erroneous or false doctrine, or for any other offence, the case is wholly different.

"The General Convention has no jurisdiction whatever in the latter case. The Constitution has expressly committed the trial of Presbyters and Deacons for any and all offences to the exclusive jurisdiction of the separate Dioceses. They are clothed with full and exclusive power of prescribing the court and the manner and the mode of the trial of Presbyters and Deacons, and there is no limitation in the Constitution upon the power of any Dioceses, in determining what number of the persons constituting the Court shall be necessary for the conviction of a Presbyter or a Deacon.

"Wherefore, your Committee submit a negative response to the enquiry contained in the resolution, and recommend the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, submitted the following reports, which were placed on the Calendar :

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a proposed amendment to Section 6, of Canon 12, Title I., relating to the officiating of Ministers within the cures of others, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that the proposed amendment is inexpedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 6, of Canon 12, Title I.

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution relating to the title of this House, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend its adoption as follows :

"Resolved, (the House of Bishops concurring), That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the House of Deputies, in making up the proceedings of this session of the General Convention for publication in the Journal of 1874, to strike out the words 'House of Clerical and Lay Deputies' wherever they occur, and insert instead thereof the words 'House of Deputies.'"

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution proposing certain amendments of the Canons on the subject of the organization of Standing Committees, have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 1, of Canon 2, of Title III., be amended so as to read as follows :

"Section 1. In every Diocese there shall be a Standing Committee, composed of an equal number of Presbyters and laymen, communicants of the Church, to be appointed by the Convention thereof, whose duties, except so far as provided for by the Canons of the General Convention, may be prescribed by the Canons of the respective Dioceses. They shall elect from their own body a president and a secretary. They may meet on their own adjournment from time to time; and the president shall have power to summon special meetings whenever he shall deem it necessary.

"The Committee on Canons, to whom were referred two proposed amendments to Canon 7, Title II., 'Of a Clergyman absenting himself from his Diocese,' respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that the proposed amendments are inexpedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendments to Canon 7, Title II., 'Of a Clergyman absenting himself from his Diocese.'

"The Committee on Canons, to whom it was referred to consider and report as to what rules, if any, should be adopted to regulate the procedure of this House in its action upon the testimonials of Bishops-elect, especially in regard to the time and manner in which charges or objections shall be received or entertained, the kind and nature of the evidence which should be admitted in regard to such charges or objections, and, finally, any such rules and regulations as in their judgment would tend to secure a just, fair, and orderly examination of the matter to be determined upon by this House, respectfully report that, on account of the magnitude and importance of the subject, they recommend that it be referred to a Special Committee to

sit during the recess, as provided for in the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the subject of the procedure in this House in its action upon the testimonials of Bishops-elect, be referred to a Special Committee of five, to consider and report to the next General Convention.

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution of enquiry as to the expediency of Canonical legislation as to the pastoral charge of chapels in Theological Seminaries, etc., respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that no such action would be expedient.

"They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of the Pastoral Charge of Chapels in Theological Seminaries, etc."

SANTEE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia, submitted the following report, which was read :

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 31 from the House of Bishops, proposing Preambles and a joint Resolution relating to the Santee Indian Reservation, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in the preambles and resolution communicated to this House in Message No. 31 from the House of Bishops and relating to the Santee Indian Reservation."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. This is in respect to the separation of a portion of the territory of Nebraska, so as to add it to the Niobrara Missionary Jurisdiction, and I am informed that the House of Bishops desire action on this subject by us now. I move, therefore, to take up this message out of its order on the Calendar for the purpose of acting on it at this time.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on that motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the House proceeded to consider the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons.

The resolution was adopted.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 54) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops hereby informs the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies that it has appointed as members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Churches, Rev. William F. Morgan, D.D., Rev. Robert S. Howland, D.D., Mr. Hamilton Fish, LL.D., and Mr. L. P. Morton."

A message (No. 55) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved, That this House concurs in Message No. 45 from the House of Deputies constituting a joint committee to arrange a time for the final adjournment of this Convention, and appoints on the part of this House the Standing Committee on the Despatch of Business, viz., the Assistant Bishop of Maryland, the Missionary Bishop of Nevada, and the Assistant Bishop of North Carolina."

VOTE UPON RITUAL CANON.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Not having been in the House yesterday when the vote was taken upon the Canon on Ritual, I desire permission to record my vote in its favor.

The PRESIDENT. Leave to record votes on that

question has already been granted to all who were absent yesterday. The gentleman from Central New York will go to the Secretary and have his name recorded. That leave, however, applies only to cases where the recording of the vote now makes no difference in the result as to any Diocese. The Chair will state that one gentleman from Michigan asks leave to record his vote, and that recording that vote would change the result as to that Diocese, not the general result. The Diocese is now recorded as voting in the negative, and if the vote now referred to is received, the Diocese will be divided.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Michigan. I suppose the Chair means the clerical vote of that Diocese?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir; the Chair will put the question to the House whether the gentleman referred to (Rev. Mr. Earp) shall be allowed to record his vote.

The Chair put the question, and declared that he could not determine the result of the voices.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I suggest that that cannot be allowed without general consent.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair, on reflection, thinks the gentleman from Maryland is correct, and therefore will not put the question, as there seems to be objection.

THE HYMNAL.

Several DEPUTIES called for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT. The regular order is the matter of the Hymnal, which is now before the House.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The Diocese of Connecticut withdraws the call for a vote by Dioceses and orders, on the motion of the gentleman from Long Island.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by Dr. Hall, to the message from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask the Secretary to read in a clear voice—first, the resolution to discharge the Committee; second, the message from the House of Bishops, which is the positive part of the whole matter; and third, the resolution that the Hymnal is not a finality; and finally, the resolution giving it over to the Trustees.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I would ask the Secretary to read the message of the House of Bishops as it would stand if the proposition of the Rev. Dr. Hall be accepted by this House as an amendment to that.

The SECRETARY. The first resolution is that the Committee be discharged. The second resolution is—

“Resolved, That this House concur in Message No. 32 of the House of Bishops.”

The third resolution contemplates an addition to that message, so that when concurred in as proposed to be amended, the resolution of the House of Bishops will read as follows:

“Resolved, That future editions of the Hymnal shall be printed so as to conform to the revised edition presented by the Joint Committee on the Hymnal; and that no other hymns be allowed in the public worship of the Church, except the Hymnal, as thus revised, and such hymns and psalms as are now ordinarily bound up with the Book of Common Prayer. *Provided*, that any congregation may continue the use of editions of the Hymnal heretofore published until further action of the Convention.

“Resolved, also, That it is the sense of this Convention that the revised Hymnal now set forth is not regarded as a finality, but that it is authorized for the time being, as a tentative process and contribution toward a more perfect and acceptable hymnal of the future.

“Resolved, also, That the Hymnal now revised and adopted is free to be printed and published by

all responsible publishers who shall obtain a license to that effect from the Trustees of the fund for the relief of widows and orphans of deceased clergymen and of aged and infirm and disabled clergymen, and who shall assure to said Trustees a payment to be applied for the uses of said fund equivalent to ten per cent. upon the retail selling price; and that the copyright of the revised Hymnal shall vest in said Trustees, subject to the further order of this Convention, and also that the Trustees be authorized to superintend the revision and publication of the revised editions of the Hymnal, with power to make typographical and literary changes necessary to conform it to the Committee's report made to this Convention.”

Rev. Mr. WARD, of Maine. I move a reconsideration of the vote on the amendment offered by the Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut. I voted against it, and now I move to reconsider that vote.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That being a new subject, I suppose it is open to remark?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, no; the House has decided to take the vote, and debate is not in order. It is now moved to reconsider the vote adverse to the amendment proposed by the Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut.

The motion to reconsider was not agreed to.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I desire to ask whether, if we vote down the report of the Committee, we shall not have our Hymnal, as at present in use, remaining for future use until the next General Convention?

The PRESIDENT. I presume so.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. As I understand the question, it is a choice between an amended Hymnal, with its mistakes corrected, or the Hymnal that we have had in use, full of mistakes, for the last three years. I suppose that is the only question before the House. If we wish to continue all the errors of the last three years—

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. That is entirely on my side of the question, but I was called to order for speaking—

The PRESIDENT. The Deputy from New Jersey is debating.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I beg pardon for repeating anything which, probably, has not been so well said. [Laughter.]

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. The Hymnal of 1871, I think, runs out by limitation. It was permitted to be used until this Convention, and if we do not now adopt this present Hymnal, we shall have none.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I rise to a point of order. This is debate.

The PRESIDENT. I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana is correct as to the matter of fact in regard to the order of 1871.

Rev. Dr. ELLIOTT, of South Carolina. I do not wish to interfere with the proceedings of the House at this stage, but I wish to ask whether the question suggested in regard to the present Hymnal running out had not better be settled before we vote.

The PRESIDENT. I certainly understand that it did not run out when I invested considerably in the old one.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I understand the question is first to be taken on the amendment.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I should like to ask one question before I vote, and that is whether under the contracts which have been made by the Trustees with the publishers there will be any opportunity for reclamations on the part of the publishers in consequence of the alterations now made if we adopt these resolutions.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I will answer that the last resolution has been drawn up by legal

gentlemen, who seem, I think, to have covered the ground, having had the point presented to them.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Then you answer "No"?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There will be no reclamations.

The PRESIDENT. The first resolution is to discharge the Committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The next resolution is that the House concur in the Message, No. 32, of the House of Bishops, with the amendment which has just been read.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. It seems to me that the vote should be taken on the message of the House of Bishops, as a whole, and then on the resolutions proposed by this Committee *separatim*.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. Does not an affirmative vote on that clause commit us to a revision of the present Hymnal?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Oh, no.

The PRESIDENT. I think the order should be the reverse of that proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina. The question is on the proposition of Dr. Hall, offered as an amendment to the message of the House of Bishops.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. We do not understand it. A resolution of concurrence simply would put us in a very awkward condition. The vote, I suppose, is to concur with qualifications. When these two resolutions are offered together as an amendment, we concur with that qualification.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The message of the House of Bishops is a proposition to this House. It comes down precisely for our consideration by way of concurrence, or concurrence with an amendment, as if it had been a resolution or Canon reported from one of our standing committees; and the rule of procedure is to take up the Canon or resolution as proposed by the House of Bishops, and amend it by adding to it or striking from it what you choose, and the final vote will be upon concurring with the House of Bishops in their Canon or resolution as amended by this House. It would be very improper to concur with the House of Bishops in their proposition, and then try to amend it. It would be too late to amend it after having concurred. We must adopt the amendments first, and then the final proposition.

The PRESIDENT. So I considered. The next resolution will be read.

The SECRETARY read:

"Resolved, also, That it is the sense of this Convention that the revised Hymnal now set forth is not regarded as a finality, but that it is authorized for the time being as a tentative process and contribution toward a more perfect and acceptable Hymnal of the Church."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I know nothing about hymnology, but I do not like to see this House couch its action in such phraseology. I want to know how a Hymnal can be a process.

The PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order.

The resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDENT. The next question is, Will the House concur in Message No. 32 of the House of Bishops, as thus amended?

The message as amended was concurred in.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I have a report to make.

Rev. Mr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Before we go to other business, may I not suggest that Dr. Fulton's correction is a mere verbal correction, which we should adopt. A Hymnal is not a "process."

The PRESIDENT. It is too late now to go back to that.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Well, sir, bad English is the curse of this Convention. [Laughter.]

RELIGIOUS REFORM ABROAD.

A message (No. 56) from the House of Bishops announced that it had concurred in Message No. 30 from the House of Deputies, communicating preamble and resolution for a Joint Committee on Ecclesiastical Relations and Religious Reform, and had appointed as the Joint Committee on the part of that House the Bishop of Connecticut, the Bishop of Delaware, the Bishop of Long Island, the Bishop of Western New York, and the Bishop of Central New York.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York, submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee upon the place of holding the next General Convention, respectfully report that they have had the matter under consideration, and submit to the Convention for its choice the cities of Boston and Philadelphia, invitations having been extended from the Deputies from the Dioceses of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

"The Committee also report that the Joint Committee recommend that this Convention adjourn at 5 o'clock Saturday afternoon, and that the House of Deputies meet the House of Bishops at half-past seven P.M., to unite in the closing devotional services, and to listen to the Pastoral Letter."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the House immediately proceed to the consideration of the question of fixing the place for holding the next Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the question be first taken on Boston. I know that the Pennsylvania Delegation will be delighted to see the Convention in Philadelphia; but the Bostonians made so strong an appeal that I cannot help voting on the first ballot for Boston.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I second the proposal of Boston as the place.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I observe that in the report of the Committee no mention is made of an invitation from New York. On behalf of the deputation of New York, I desire to say that New York, now and for ever hereafter, desires to receive the Convention.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. We thought that was understood.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I do not know whether any invitation has come from the Diocese of Kentucky, or any other Dioceses than those mentioned; but for one I think that the West ought to have a voice in this matter, and as it is more central than Boston, I will take it upon myself to nominate to the Convention the city of Louisville as the place for the next meeting.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. There were several cities proposed to the Joint Committee by Bishops and Deputies, including Chicago, St. Louis, and Detroit; but the Committee were of the opinion that the cities of Boston and Philadelphia presented the greatest advantages for holding the next session of the General Convention.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. In reference to the invitation from New York, I think the maxim applies, that as any time is no time in particular, so an invitation for all time amounts not to an invitation for the next time. Therefore, I move that New York be ruled out. [Laughter.]

But, sir, I wish to speak in behalf of the delegation from Massachusetts, who, I believe, are unanimous in their wishes that the Convention should meet there, and inasmuch as it would be a new

thing in the history of the Church, and inasmuch as it is a region in which it is specially desirable that our Church should impress herself in her peculiar characteristics, and in order that her influence may be more strong and lasting, I think that the friends of the Church at large, if they will consider all the bearings of the question, will be ready to yield to the claims that Massachusetts urges in this behalf now, as the question is first to be tried on Boston, I really hope it may go there. But I will yield to the Lay Deputy from Massachusetts [Mr. Mudge], who, when he speaks, speaks to the purpose so far as all the availabilities are concerned.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I wish to withdraw my nomination of Louisville. I have no right to a personal preference about it. I simply want to show that the delegation from Louisiana have no objection at all to Boston. It was not any objection to Boston that made me nominate Louisville; on the contrary, we would be glad to go to Boston. We honor Boston; we know that she stood up to us at the hour of our peril. When we needed aid and brotherly kindness, Boston came forward with the hand of brotherly love and charity, and poured upon us that material aid which was so necessary to us when our people were overflowed, and their crops and cattle, and all they had, destroyed. It was not because I opposed Boston, but because I thought the West, Louisville being more central, would be the better place. I withdraw it, and most heartily do I concur in the nomination of Boston.

Mr. MUDGE, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on the part of the Lay Deputies from Massachusetts I wish to endorse most heartily what was said by the Rev. Dr. Vinton. He spoke for the clergy, and he said, as I feel, that it would be a great occasion for this Convention to impress upon the State of Massachusetts, and upon the whole of New England, the greatness and the glory of our Church, for when this Convention meets from every State and Territory and Missionary district in this land, it has an aspect of greatness and glory such as no other Church in this country can present. Feeling this, Mr. President, I hope and trust and beg that you will accept our invitation to come to Boston. We feel that we can offer you a better missionary ground for the Church in the future than any other part of this country. [Applause.]

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Mr. President, there has been but one meeting of this body in New England since the foundation of our ecclesiastical union, and that was at New Haven, in 1811, when two Bishops only were present, and the Church in this country was just beginning to rise from its lowest depths of depression. I am sure we should give the Convention a most hearty welcome in New Haven again, that old historic place, although it is the very cradle of Congregationalism. But I go for the next best place, if we cannot have it in New Haven, and that is Boston.

Rev. Mr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the city I live in is known as the heart of Massachusetts. My colleagues have spoken for that city which is the head of Massachusetts. I wish simply to say that your welcome to Massachusetts will come from both head and heart.

Mr. CORNWALL, of Kentucky. Mr. President, the characteristic modesty or this delegation has imposed on me the duty of inviting the Convention to the city of Louisville. With all due diffidence we speak on this subject. We have there not quite so good accommodations as you have in the city of New York, but we think you will be welcomed by our people generally. If you shall select Louisville you will see a very beautiful city, and you will be welcomed by a warm-

hearted people. You will find them a people not on the extreme boundaries of the Union, but right near the centre of it; you will see a most beautiful country; and you will be welcomed in a very hospitable manner; at least we will use every effort to make your stay comfortable and pleasant. We have churches there that would accommodate this House of Deputies quite as well as this church in which we sit, and we could accommodate the House of Bishops without going to any very great distance. I believe I but express the wish of every churchman in Kentucky when I say that we should be glad to see you in Louisville. If the city of Richmond in 1859, with a smaller population, could entertain the General Convention, I think you may feel confident that we can do it to your satisfaction.

Rev. Mr. PORTER, of South Carolina. Mr. President, we have no doubt that to whatever city we may go, this Convention will be heartily welcomed; but I beg to move that when this Convention adjourns, it adjourns to meet in Boston.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I get up, sir, on behalf of the Delegation from Louisiana, to invite you to hold the next General Convention in the city of New Orleans. We promise you a much warmer reception than our friends in Boston can give you; but if I cannot get New Orleans, then I shall go, in the language of my friend across the way, for the next best place, for Boston. [Laughter.]

Rev. Mr. EASTON, of California. I am instructed by the Delegation from California to extend to you an invitation to the city of San Francisco, and I have an argument that I think this House will listen to. Everybody has expressed a desire that this House should be lessened in numbers; and it is thought that if the Convention would sit in San Francisco that end would be reached. [Laughter.]

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, there is one place that has not yet been mentioned, and I am authorized to present it to this Convention. It is the city of Minneapolis [Laughter], and I can give you an important reason why that city should be selected. It is on the parallel of forty-five degrees, exactly half way between the pole and the equator [Laughter]; it is exactly midway between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and as we believe it is yet to be the true capital of this country, I think it a most appropriate place. Again, last year that city was the place of the meeting of the American Board, and I beg leave to say that we entertained two thousand members of that Board without the payment of one single cent, and we will extend the like invitation to this Convention to meet in Minneapolis.

Rev. Mr. MCILWAIN, of Iowa. Mr. President, we have been informed by the last gentleman who spoke that where he lives is the centre of the earth. I have not lived long, but I have lived long enough to learn that where I live is not the centre of the earth. We are told the East abounds in generosity, and we know the reason why. It has had opportunities to cultivate generosity. Now I speak a word for the West. We ask for the opportunity to cultivate generosity on our part. We are willing, however, to yield, and yield gracefully to the East; but we ask you with all our heart to come and sit beside the Father of Waters. I therefore propose St. Louis.

The PRESIDENT. Will the Chairman of the Committee state the form of the resolution?

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. The Committee proposes two names, Boston and Philadelphia. A motion has since been made that Boston be voted on first.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I move to strike out the word "Philadelphia," so as to leave Boston,

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. We do not offer any resolution.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is that the next General Convention meet in the city of Boston.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that the vote just taken be communicated to the House of Bishops at once.

The motion was agreed to.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I now ask for action on the other matter reported by the Committee.

The Secretary read the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Convention adjourn at five o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and that the House of Deputies meet the House of Bishops at 7:30 P.M., to unite in the closing devotional services, and to listen to the Pastoral letter."

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I move as an amendment Friday afternoon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. The clergy have expected to have this Church as usual on Saturday afternoon at three o'clock.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. It is not proposed to hold the evening session here.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I move to amend the resolution by striking out "five" o'clock and inserting "three." Before the question is put, I ask the consent of the House to make one or two remarks, very brief and yet important.

The Deputies from New York, upon whom devolved the duty of allotting seats for the representatives of the Dioceses, found this difficulty, that by the constitution every Diocese was entitled to eight seats, and we were obliged to allot eight seats to every Diocese, although we were conscious that some of the Dioceses from distant parts would not send their full delegation. Now if the Deputies from Massachusetts have permission to appropriate such number of seats as in their judgment shall be sufficient, we shall be brought closer together than we have been here under the resolution which was passed in 1871, whereby the Deputies from New York were compelled to allot eight seats to each Diocese. I therefore at the proper time—it probably will come in after this resolution—will move a resolution that the Deputies from the Diocese wherein the next General Convention holds its meetings shall have power to appropriate sufficient seats for the Deputies as to them shall seem meet. You observe this gives them a discretion which perhaps the House would not be willing to give.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I only want to say to the Deputy from New York, that I wish at the proper time to push the amendment I proposed, that Friday shall be substituted for Saturday. The reason is obvious, I think, to all the gentlemen present. Even during the Saturdays when we have been in session here, the House has been thinner than on other days, and I fancy that by Saturday evening there will hardly be a corporal's guard left. Gentlemen must go home, clergymen especially, to attend their parishes for Sunday.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I think it is inexpedient that the House should not resolve to adjourn on Friday. We want a day for the transaction of the real business of this House. Having finished these measures which have led to long debate, in the course of to-morrow I do not doubt many messages of considerable importance can be sent to the House of Bishops, and if this House adjourns on Friday, the Constitutional time for the concurrence or non-concurrence of the House of Bishops will not have elapsed, and if that House shall not act upon our messages

sent to them to-morrow, they will fall to the ground entirely. I think, therefore, for this reason, it is better for the House, if it can, to remain in session until Saturday afternoon.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. There is a great deal of work yet to be done by this Convention, work that has been referred to the committees, which have been laboriously engaged in their duties, and it is work, moreover, of no mean importance. In the course of the Ritual discussion, it was brought out that there was a strong feeling in favor, among other things, of a Rubrical Commission to revise the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer in a large-minded, comprehensive, catholic spirit. To that end, if the Convention adopts that report of the Committee on Canons, it will be necessary that a commission should be raised with extreme care. Not only must we have men of learning, but we must have men of candor and breadth of view on that commission. I consider that the selection of that commission will be one of the greatest acts of this Convention.

Again, there are other matters to be brought before the Convention. Our Committee on Canons has now many things ready or on the point of being ready. I do not think that unless we have a night session we can rightfully adjourn before Saturday afternoon. I therefore trust that this Convention will either determine to sit at night, or sit till Saturday afternoon, or both, in order that the work may be done, and well and maturely done, with the full voice of a full House.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I would ask the Secretary to state the matters that are now before us that have to be acted on before we adjourn.

The SECRETARY. There are twenty-six items on the Calendar. There are twenty-two reports from the Committee on Canons yet to be acted on; there are ten reports, if I am right in a hasty reckoning—six came in this very day—from the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. We have to take a vote by Dioceses and Orders on ratifying the change in Article 4 of the Constitution; and we have now five special orders of the day yet undecided.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Canons how many matters they have before the House not acted upon?

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I cannot answer that question, but I am perfectly confident that the Committee on Canons can get through their docket, without any difficulty, by Friday night.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move an amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Central Pennsylvania. I believe his motion was that we should adjourn on Friday evening at ten o'clock.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. Friday afternoon at five. I should be very glad to add to that, that we have one night session in the meantime as well.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I was going to move that we have two evening sessions, one on Thursday and one on Friday.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Why not take the question on agreeing to adjourn at five o'clock on Saturday?

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I wish the Convention could adjourn on Friday night, but if there be anything in the point which has been submitted to us by the gentleman from Central New York, it is impossible that we can adjourn even on Saturday. The Constitution requires that the House of Bishops shall have three days to act upon anything we send them, and therefore whatever we do to-morrow may not

necessarily be completed by the House of Bishops if we adjourn on Saturday. They require three full days. It seems to me that if the questions before us are to be settled by this Convention, it is impossible for us to adjourn this week. I wish we could.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I wish the Convention would stop this discussion and go to work on the Calendar. If we finish our work before Saturday and the House of Bishops advise us that they are ready to adjourn, we can then adjourn; but if we go on spending our time in this discussion now, we shall certainly not adjourn on Saturday.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. We certainly have a very large amount of work upon our docket, and it depends on the Convention whether that work shall be done at all; whether it shall be done carelessly or negligently, which would of course be a great deal worse than doing it not at all; or whether we shall stay here and spend our time as we ought to do. I do not think the Convention is now prepared to fix a time when we shall adjourn. I believe that during to-day and to-morrow, after having worked upon our docket and seen what we have cleared off and what will still remain, we shall then be able to decide whether we can, in justice to the Church that we represent, adjourn this week. So far as adjourning on Friday is concerned, we might as well adjourn now. The greater part of the work which the different committees have presented to you still remains to be considered, and a great portion of it ought to be well and deliberately considered, or else be thrown over to the next General Convention.

Mr. COPPEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I am quite convinced by what has been said since I moved the amendment, and I now withdraw it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move to postpone the consideration of the question of the time of adjournment until to-morrow at four o'clock.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. It is evident to all members that it is necessary to give the House of Bishops three days' notice, that they may act with knowledge. I think, therefore, it is better to stick to five o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It is suggested to me that the motion proper to be made is to lay this question on the table. If that be done, it can be taken up at any time we think proper. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. According to the order of the day, heretofore fixed, the report of the Committee on Canons on Baptismal Service was to be taken up immediately after the disposition of the Hymnal, but the time is so near for taking up the confirmation of the Missionary Bishops, that it has been suggested that that be postponed until to-morrow at twelve o'clock, and made the order of the day then. I make that motion.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I ask if there is not an order already made for that hour?

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. This has the preference. But if you choose to make it the order of the day for eleven o'clock, it will satisfy me.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I think we had better stop making special orders, and go on and clear the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The motion, as I understand it, is to make the report of the Committee on Canons, in regard to the Baptismal Office, the special order for to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. In view of the fact that there is so heavy an amount of work to be

done, which will require carefulness as well as promptness, and promptness no less than carefulness, I move that, with the exception of Chairman of Committees representing proposals coming from Committees, this House hereafter limit all speeches to ten minutes.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I would make one exception, and that is the discussion of the Baptismal question.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. That is too important a question to be limited to ten minutes.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I am appealed to to except the question of the Baptismal office. I do so. My motion, therefore, will be that in all business to be transacted hereafter, with the exception of the Baptismal Office, speeches shall be limited to ten minutes, except only chairmen representing committees.

The PRESIDENT. Is there to be no limit of time on the baptismal question?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. It appears to be acceptable that twenty minutes should be the rule during the discussion on the Baptismal Service, and I will incorporate that.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. I know many that will be limited by that at the time the debate is going on.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Deputy from Alabama that debate on all questions that come before this House during the session, except the Baptismal question, shall be limited to ten minutes to each speech, and that on the Baptismal question they shall be limited to twenty minutes, with the exception of chairmen of committees.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON THE RITUAL CANON.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Is the Calendar now in order? If so, I call for it.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first matter in order on the Calendar.

Mr. FORSYTH, of Albany. I rise to a question of privilege. In the report of the vote taken upon the Canon on the Ritual, as appears in the official or semi-official paper of this House, THE CHURCHMAN, the Lay Deputies from the Diocese of Albany are reported as voting in the affirmative for that Canon. The fact is that they all voted the other way. We desire to have the record corrected in that respect.

The SECRETARY. The record of the Secretary is correct. I am informed by the proprietors of THE CHURCHMAN that they have discovered the error alluded to and other errors in the statement of that vote, and intend to make a correction.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. There was a sufficiently small minority, and we wish to have the benefit of it.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

A message (No. 57) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, The Chief Magistrate of the United States has asked the co-operation of this Church, and of other religious bodies, in promoting the civilization of the Indians by procuring for them moral and intelligent agents, by supervising their work, and by assisting those agents to industrial pursuits; and

"Whereas, The Indian Commission of the Board of Missions has acceded to the request of the President of the United States so far as to nominate agents for certain tribes of Indians; and

"Whereas, It is expedient that the hands of these should be upheld by the Churches, and that the Indians should be protected in their rights; therefore,

"Resolved, That this House, with the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, will ap-

point a Standing Committee on Indian Affairs, composed of six laymen, to co-operate with the Board of Missions by supervising the secular work of the agencies under their care, by procuring such civilizing agencies as the Government does not provide, and by invoking the aid of the Government, and, if need be, the assistance of the courts, in protecting the rights of the Indians.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is not that just what we did?

The SECRETARY. We have passed by the action of this House a similar resolution. This now makes it the work of the General Convention, instead of this House.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Then I move that the message of the House of Bishops be concurred in; and that will settle the matter.

The motion to concur was agreed to.

DELEGATES FROM MISSIONARY DISTRICTS.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Calendar, on which the first business was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to the standing order of 'Delegates from Missionary Jurisdictions.'"

The resolution was agreed to.

PRESIDING BISHOP.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons on a Canon proposed by Rev. Mr. Knickerbacker of Minnesota:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed Canon of the Presiding Bishop."

The resolution was agreed to.

The next Business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported from the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment of [6] Section 7 of Canon 13 of Title I., relating to Standing Committees in Missionary jurisdiction, proposed to this House in Message No. 9, from the House of Bishops."

The resolution was agreed to.

NICENE CREED.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on the Prayer-Book relating to the Nicene Creed, to which is appended the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this Church ought not to enter upon any consideration of the proposition to revise the Nicene Creed until it can be done in united council of all those autonomous churches using the English rite and in communion with this Church and the Church of England."

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I presume from the tenor of this report it is intended to be entirely disinterested, dispassionate, and it is therefore not an *ex parte* one. I call attention, however, to the ambiguity of a certain word in this report, that is to say, the word "orthodox." It is therein stated that the use of the *Filioque* in the creed is capable of an orthodox interpretation, thereby giving rise to the inference that the ordinary, literal interpretation of the term is not orthodox. It would strike many readers reading this report that the word "orthodox" here is used in a technical sense, as used by those who speak of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church. I think the report should not be ambiguous, and should not seem to give any meaning to one side or the other of this controverted question, which, under the present phraseology, it strikes me it does seem to do. I therefore would

like to move the substitution of some other word, or at least that this report be recommitted, in order to be amended in this particular.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Is the word "orthodox" to be found in the resolution or in the report?

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. It is used in the report.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. This House is not bound by the language of the report; it is only bound by the language of the resolution.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. The report will go on the Journal, and therefore it would seem to have been in the mind of this Convention that the word "orthodox" in this particular does mean what is not in accordance with the literal interpretation of this word.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. That is a matter the House has nothing to do with, but only the Committee who drafted the report. What we have to do with is the resolution. I move that it be adopted.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. I have been trying to get the eye of the Chair. I only want to say that the word can be used in two senses; and if the whole Convention should say that our creed was correct in that respect, that would be no authority. I want to express my opinion. I know I cannot change the determination of this body. No one who has ever examined the question tells us that it is historic; and who can say that that word "proceeded" has not the two literal senses and cannot be accommodated to any sense at all?

ARTICLE 4 OF CONSTITUTION.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is a resolution respecting Article 4 of the Constitution, reported on the 14th day, by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to wit:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the alteration of Article 4 of the Constitution proposed in the last General Convention, and made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, and printed on page 160 of the Journal of the last General Convention, be and the same is hereby finally agreed to and ratified, as provided by Article 9 of the Constitution."

This requires a vote by Dioceses and orders.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move that we proceed to vote.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Will the Secretary read the amendment?

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Article 4 of the Constitution be amended by omitting the last seven words, 'by any Church destitute of a Bishop,' and substituting the words 'in another Diocese by the ecclesiastical authority thereof,' so that the Article shall read:

"Article 4. The Bishop or Bishops in every Diocese shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of that Diocese, and every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal Office to his proper Diocese, unless requested to ordain or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal Office, in another Diocese by the Ecclesiastical authority thereof."

The PRESIDENT. The question has to be taken by Dioceses and Orders.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. If we get a unanimous vote, that will include all the Dioceses. I move that the resolution be adopted unanimously.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Cannot the Secretary just call the Dioceses by name, Alabama, etc., without taking the vote of each individual?

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. We can cast one solid vote for each Order in each deputation.

The PRESIDENT. The Dioceses will be called, and will vote as they are called. It is supposed that the action of the House will be unanimous, so as to save calling so many names.

Mr. WHITTLE, of Georgia. I hope I may be allowed to explain this vote. This amendment most certainly ought to pass. As the law now stands, no Bishop has a right to exercise Episcopal functions beyond the limits of his Diocese, except in the case of a vacancy. This law provides that he may so act on the invitation of the Diocese. That is simply the provision. It was referred to the Committee on Canons last Convention, and I believe unanimously reported in favor of.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of Dioceses.

The Dioceses were called with the following result:

CLERICAL VOTE.—*Aye*.—Alabama, Albany, California, Central New York, Central Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Delaware, Easton, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin—40.

LAY VOTE.—*Aye*.—Alabama, Albany, Central New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Easton, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin—38.

The PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment of the Constitution is finally ratified, so far as depends on this House.

LECTIONARY FOR LENT.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Joint Committee to prepare the new Lectionary for week-days in Lent, copies of which will be distributed.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. That report has never been read. I call for its reading.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

"The Joint Committee, to whom was assigned by the last General Convention the preparation of a Table of Lessons for the week-days of Lent, beg leave to report the accompanying table and resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Table of Lessons reported by the Committee be authorized for use till the next General Convention, provided the same shall be approved by the Bishop of each Diocese or Missionary Jurisdiction, respectively.

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee be continued in charge of this matter for its more thorough consideration, and to afford opportunity for such improvements as may be suggested by its actual use.

"The Committee would add that whilst engaged in the duty assigned to them they have also prepared a table of lessons for the Ember and Rogation days, regarding this, though not specified, as embraced in the spirit and aim of the resolution under which they were appointed, and recommend the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Table of Lessons for the Ember and Rogation Days, herewith presented by

the Committee, be authorized for use on the same condition as the Table of Lessons for Lent."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Is the report signed?

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. It is signed by all the members of the Joint Committee. I ask the Secretary to read the names.

The Secretary read as follows:

"ALEX. GREGG, J. FREEMAN YOUNG, M. A. DE W. HOWE, T. W. COIT, ALFRED B. BEACH, E. E. BEARDSLEY, ISAAC G. HUBBARD, CHARLES R. HALE."

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Under the action of the Convention the other day upon the resolution offered by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, as I understand, it will be impossible for us to get the use of this Lectionary under three years. Am I right in that?

The PRESIDENT. I do not recollect the decision of the House.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Is this Lectionary part of the Prayer-Book? If it is, nothing but a constitutional amendment would reach it.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Now I have the answer for that question. Under the action of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, it is impossible for us to pass this first resolution, inasmuch as they have decided that this cannot be altered under three years.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. That has not passed this House. Their report simply goes on the Calendar, to come up in its order.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. It will do no harm, at any rate, for me to move the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee be continued in charge of this matter for its more thorough consideration, and to afford opportunity for such improvements as may be suggested by its actual use."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I make this suggestion: The report from the Committee on Canons, which will be made the order of the day on Friday, provides for a commission to revise the Rubrics of the Prayer-Book, and many other things to prepare a new Lectionary especially for Lent. If that be adopted, it will undoubtedly cover the resolution which the gentleman now offers, and I presume it will be adopted; but inasmuch as it may miscarry by press of time or for other reasons, and inasmuch as we all admit that we do require a new Lectionary, and it is conceded that it will require three years to give us that Lectionary, I am prepared now to move that this Lectionary be proposed by this General Convention for adoption at the next. It does not require a change of the Constitution. That is a misconception. The Constitution itself, in Article 8, provides that alterations and changes in the Prayer-Book may be made (and of course a Lectionary is a portion of the Prayer Book) at one General Convention, and adopted at the other. We therefore by such action do not touch the Constitution; we simply act under the Constitution. It is Article 9 which provides how changes in the Constitution may be made.

Of the Lectionary which has now been presented I know nothing, but am willing to take it from the Committee as they have presented it; and if it be the sense of the House that this Lectionary should be at all events proposed for adoption, if they have such confidence in the Committee as to be willing to propose it for adoption and thereby save three years, the only way in which it can be done is now by action of this House to propose it for adoption at the next General Convention, and if then it be adopted it will become final.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I wish to say on behalf of the Committee—

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I shall be through in one moment. I wish simply to say that a Lectionary for the whole Christian year has been prepared by this Committee. It was a Joint Committee, appointed in 1868. If the Committee on the revision of the Rubrics—

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Committee on Canons have presented a report, asking this House to raise a Commission to revise the Rubrics, and to take into consideration the adoption of a new Lectionary as a portion of the measure, which they are now prepared to advocate. Of course, we may prepare a Lectionary without touching the Rubrics, except in that particular, but the object of the Committee was to have a general revision of the Rubrics, and especially that that Commission have in charge the preparation of a new Lectionary, especially for Lent; but the members will perceive that that will postpone action for six years, because that Commission cannot report until the next General Convention.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. The Committee on Constitutional Amendments have prepared a report extending the Constitution in such a general manner that we can pass the Lectionary at the next General Convention without proposing it at this. Adopt it first by this Convention, and then ratify it by the next Convention, and then any Convention will have it in its power, without its being proposed to the previous Convention, to adopt what you suggest.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I understand that; but that depends on two contingencies. It depends upon the contingency of our proposing that amendment or agreeing to it, if it should ever be reached; and, in the second place, whether it will be acted upon favorably by the next General Convention, which are two very doubtful contingencies; but as a Lectionary for the whole year which this Committee has prepared, I for one am willing to vote for it now, without knowing anything of it more than that it has come from that Committee, and let it rest for three years, so that independently of all other contingencies, if we approve it, we may finally agree to it and ratify it and make it the Lectionary of the Church, of which we all know the great want.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. Dr. Beach gave way to the gentleman from Pittsburgh.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. That explanation has involved me in so much talk in connection with the whole subject that I propose to leave it. I take it for granted this Convention does not propose to leave two committees engaged on one and the same work.

This Joint Committee which was appointed in 1868 will have to be discharged from this whole matter, and then the work which they have accomplished can be passed over to this Committee, if it is raised or created; and it strikes me that on the Calendar we are getting somewhat mixed. If we knew what these propositions were to be, and what action would be taken by this Convention upon them, then we should be enabled to go over this matter with something like order. But as it stands now, I am forestalling, it seems, by this report some work which it is proposed to do hereafter touching the same subject. I move that this report be laid on the table until the report of the Committee on Canons touching the Rubrical revision is reached, and that it be taken up in connection with that subject.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. This Committee have prepared a portion of a Lectionary, and they submit it to us. Why not let that go down to all the Dioceses and return here at the next Conven-

tion? If you do that, you can act upon this portion of their report at all events. We need not discharge the Committee. They remain to perfect their work, and, so far as they have gone, we can act on it in 1877. Now, it is not well to trust to what is to be done by this House as to amendments to the Constitution or the Prayer-Book, because there is a difference of opinion about that even in our own Committee, and I shall certainly be very loth to see this House adopt such a resolution as is said to have been reported by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and I shall ask a hearing on that subject. This Committee can now act directly and act securely if they will only send down this Lectionary as a proposal that the Lectionary shall be so amended in the particulars which they have named, and hereafter, when they have completed their labors, send the rest. You act upon the Prayer-Book, you do not act upon the Constitution.

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. It is four o'clock, and I call for the order of the day.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. That is out of order. There is a motion to lay this report on the table.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. If the gentleman making the report will allow me to offer a substitute for his motion, I desire to introduce two resolutions, which send this Lectionary down. I wish to move that this Table of Lessons be sent to the Dioceses for consideration. I wish to move, second,

“Resolved, that the said proposition be made known to the several Diocesan Conventions.”

Because it has to be sent down by resolution. That places it before the Dioceses, and it may be acted upon at the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Will you include in that the Table of Lessons for the Rogation Days and Ember Days?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I will.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. And the Lectionary for the whole Christian year?

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Yes, as you have reported them.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. It may be proper for me here to state that this is to all intents and purposes the same with the new Lectionary of the Church of England. I will withdraw my motion for that of the gentleman from Texas.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Then I move that the Lectionary as just reported be proposed, and I move this resolution—“That the Secretary be directed to transmit said proposition to the several Dioceses.” That conforms to the eighth article exactly.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I submit there will be an interference with the other measures proposed by the Committee on Canons, which proposes to take up this very subject. The Commission on the Revision of Rubrics will be acting upon this very question at the same time that this precise form of it is presented to the Dioceses.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. This only allows us to act upon both three years hence. That is all it does, and if we do not do this we may be compelled, and shall be compelled, to go six years. That is the only difference.

The PRESIDENT. The time has now arrived for the order of the day.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I think we can vote on the question before us now.

The PRESIDENT. Is the House ready for the question on the resolution? “Yes.”

Mr. DE ROSSET, of North Carolina. Must we not take the vote on that by Dioceses and orders?

Mr. BATTLE, of North Carolina. I call for the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day is called for, and we must go to that.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. There are three minutes left.

The PRESIDENT. It will take a great deal more than three minutes. We have to take the vote by Dioceses and orders.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Not unless it is called for.

The PRESIDENT. To change the Prayer-Book? Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. This does not change the Prayer-Book. It only proposes to change it.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. There are some members who wish to express their views on this question a little more fully. There will be further debate on it if we insist on taking the question now. ["Order of the Day."]

MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The SECRETARY. The order of the day is a message from the House of Bishops nominating a Missionary Bishop to Shanghai, China, together with the nominations sent down from the House of Bishops this morning.

All persons having retired from the Chapel except the Deputies and the Secretary and his Assistants, the House proceeded with closed doors to consider the nominations for Missionary Bishops, sent down from the House of Bishops.

The House remained in secret session till the usual hour of adjournment, when it adjourned till to-morrow morning at nine o'clock.

TWENTIETH DAY.

THURSDAY, October 29.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A. M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Giles A. Easton, of California. The Lessons were read by Rev. Edwin M. Van Deusen, D.D., of Central New York. The Creed and Prayers were said by the Right Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., Bishop of Albany, who also pronounced the Benediction.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

PLACE OF MEETING.

A message (No. 58) from the House of Bishops announced that the House had concurred with Message No. 47 from the House of Deputies naming Boston as the place for the meeting of the next General Convention.

SECRET SESSION.

On motion of Mr. BIRDSALL, of California, it was

"Ordered, That at two o'clock to-day the House go into secret session for the purpose of considering the nominations of Missionary Bishops."

BOARD OF MISSIONS.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I present the report of the Committee on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. The Committee stand ready to read by title or to read through the document, just as the Convention wishes.

The PRESIDENT. Perhaps it had better be read by title, to save time.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I move that the report be read by its title.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland:

"The Committee on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society beg leave to report:

"As the meeting of the Board of Missions every third year is held simultaneously with the General

Convention, and as the whole Church is represented in both of those bodies, it does not seem necessary to present to this latter any extended notice of the proceedings of the former. It is one of the auspicious signs of life and light in the Church that the participation of her members in her missionary council is becoming so general and hearty. It is to be hoped that the time is not far off when legislation itself will pause for a day or more, and suspend its deliberations or enactments in favor of a higher contemplation of the needs of the Church in that which most intimately concerns both its vitality and its growth. It would be well to refresh one's faith when the disturbances, the jars, the causes of disquiet, the hindrances and clogs of the hour call for interference by law, by looking away to the magnificent promise and opportunity of good presented to our view in the providence of God, as well as to the attempt of the Church to respond to the summons.

"The spread and increase of the kingdom of Christ are apparent on every side. From the mission that penetrates into lanes and alleys to that which overtakes the pioneer on the outskirts, or carries its blessings into heathen wilds—all is cheering—save the lack of means. Both the laborer and his hire are wanting. The harvestman to go wherever his Lord shall bid him to gather in the sheaves, and the 'sending' of that harvestman fully furnished and abetted on the part of the Church, there the great needs are inadequately supplied. The slow increase of the ministry is alarming, but still more disquieting is the inability of Committees to meet their obligations through a failure of gifts and of the chief pastors of the fold to fill vacancies in their missionary appointments.

"Your Committee entrusted to subcommittees of their body to report, and reports them back as their own, and I now present to this House: 1st. The report which relates to domestic missions. 2d. The Indian Commission. 3d. Home missions to colored people. 4th. Foreign missions. 5th. The women's auxiliary to the Board."

The Committee report the following resolutions:

"Whereas, The Board of Missions is seriously considering a proposal to embrace the several departments of Mission work in one large committee, to discuss all important subjects with the view of promoting harmonious action, and then commit the several departments to subcommittees; and whereas, a resolution has been adopted by the Board of Missions referring this important subject to a large committee for consideration and report;

"Therefore, resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, that in the event of the approval by the Board of Missions, when the General Convention is not in session, of the plan referred to in the foregoing preamble, said Board is hereby authorized to appoint eight additional members to their Standing Committees, making twenty-four in all to carry out such plan as may be adopted by the Board of Missions, and to report to the General Convention at its next session such amendments of the Constitution as may be necessary to give the plan stability and authority.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America be amended by changing, in the first line of Article XII., the word 'clergyman' to 'person'; by inserting, in the second line of the same Article, before the words 'until after,' the following words: 'except with the express consent of the Board of Missions'; in line 7 by striking out 'person' and inserting 'Clerical Missionary'; and striking out the words 'a missionary'; and by adding, at the close of the whole Article, the following words: "Or of a Church in full com-

munion with this Church and connected therewith by recognized official relations.'

"Article XII. will then read thus:

"ARTICLE XII.

"No person shall be appointed a missionary by the Board, or by either of the Committees, except with the express consent of the Board of Missions, until after conference with the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or Missionary District to which he belongs, nor shall any missionary be sent to officiate in any Diocese or Missionary District without the consent of the ecclesiastical authority of the same, except when regularly called by an organized parish, in accordance with the Canons, both Diocesan and general, and no clerical missionary shall be appointed who is not at the time a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of regular standing, or of a Church in full communion with this Church and connected therewith by recognized official relations.

"Whereas, The Board of Missions is acting under the authority of the General Convention, and should in all important measures be controlled by its fundamental principles; therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Article 7 of the Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society be amended by inserting the following words at the end of the first line of the second paragraph, after the word 'quorum,': 'and in all questions, when required by three members, the clerical and lay members of the Board of Missions shall vote separately, and their concurrence shall be necessary to constitute a vote.'

"Whereas, The proposed increase in the Episcopate for Domestic and Foreign Missions, and the call for greater efficiency in missions to the Indian and the colored races, evinces a large development of missionary zeal and faith, and will require a liberal supply of men and money; therefore,

"Resolved, That each parish minister be requested to disseminate information likely to develop an intelligent zeal for missions, and also to form organizations that each parish may become a missionary training-school, and that contributions for missions may be systematically collected."

Rev. Mr. HENSHAW, of Rhode Island. Let the resolutions go on the Calendar.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. These are very important matters that require the action of the House of Bishops. They require concurrence.

Rev. Mr. HENSHAW, of Rhode Island. There is a very important resolution there that requires consideration.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If the Secretary will read the resolution separately, any one can lay over that is objected to. The House of Bishops must act on them, or they will not become the law.

The Secretary read the first resolution.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. This is merely giving the Board of Missions, at its next meeting, authority to work out a plan by which it is thought the Missions of this Church will be brought into harmony. There is no objection to it, I think.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. There is no amendment to the Constitution proposed here?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. No, sir.

The first resolution was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next resolution, proposing a change in Article 12 of the Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Those who neglected their duty last night and did not go to the Board of Missions, will perhaps be ignorant as to this. The whole matter was fully discussed there. We learned that instead of appointing a Bishop for Hayti, they asked the Church in Hayti to elect

their own Bishop, for they desire to have that in perfect accord with the Church in this country. Under the Constitution as it stands, they cannot do it. It is believed also that there is a great amount of right spirit in Mexico that under the present constitution our Missionary Board is restricted from helping in the best way. There is no restriction in the Church Missionary Society at all. They can help it, but our Society is restricted.

Again it has been usual to send out others than clergymen. The Foreign Committee have taken the responsibility of doing it. There is no authority in the Constitution for it. It was thought that so large a body as the Board of Missions, especially as you put the restriction on them, that they can call for a vote by orders at any time, should have specifically the authority to do what they have been actually doing for years. They have sent women out, noble women. Those who were in Grace Church the other day understood that when they were asked in the House of Bishops whether there was not some suitable person in China who could be elected to the Episcopate, it was said, "Yes, there is; but she is a woman, and not a man, and therefore we cannot elect her." What they want is simply authority to work.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I move the passage of the resolution.

Rev. Mr. HENSHAW, of Rhode Island. I wish to ask a question whether this does not give permission to the Board to employ a person who is not a minister of this Church; that is to say, a minister of some of the denominations around us, if they wish to do so? That is one point that I want brought out here this morning. I understood the Bishop of Niobrara last night to state that it did.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I think the question put by the gentleman is a very important one. I attended the Missionary meeting last night, and that question was put by the Bishop of Niobrara, and I understood him to admit that it would authorize the employment of dissenting Ministers from their own churches in any portion of the world where we choose to establish missions; that it could be done in Hayti; that it could be done in Mexico, to the extent that disaffected Presbyters of the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico—those were not his words, but that was the necessary inference—could be taken under the pay and into the service of the Board of Missions of this Protestant Episcopal Church. Now, I say that is a very radical innovation upon the policy of this Church. I do not think we ought to subsidize disaffected Roman Catholic ministers, or pension them, or take them under our control or pay. If they are fit for ordination, or rather reception without ordination, all right. I do not think, though, that the General Convention of this Church ought to undertake to have an *imperium in imperio* in another man's Diocese, or inside of the Church of somebody else. It struck me so last night, though I did not participate in the debate. I thought it a very important enquiry how far this Church is to become the proselyter and the innovator into other domains.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. It will be seen by this Article that while it would be possible to say that a person might be appointed a missionary by the Board who was a Presbyterian clergyman, yet he cannot be appointed until after conference with the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or Missionary District to which he belongs. When we come to the point of the Clerical Missionary, who is to act as such abroad, the whole matter is guarded carefully. He must be a minister of this Church, in regular standing, or else of a Church in full communion with our Church.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. Must not this go on the Calendar if it excites discussion?

Rev. Mr. HENSHAW, of Rhode Island. I say that when a committee present a report or resolution to this body or to the Board of Missions, or to any other body by which they are appointed, it is supposed that they understand its meaning. Last evening the Bishop of Niobrara, who presented these resolutions, was asked the question, and he answered it distinctly, "Will not this change in the Constitution make it possible for the Board to appoint a missionary not of this Church, if this amendment to the Constitution takes place?" and his reply was, "It will."

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. As a member of the Board of Missions, I ask for only a moment in which to remove the apprehension of the eminent Deputy from Tennessee that the proposed employment of auxiliaries in foreign countries will work a "radical revolution" in our missionary work. It will not and cannot be "radical," because it cannot reach the great "root" of the Protestant Episcopal Church, so deeply planted in our broad continent, and so well able to sustain any growth or expansion of the majestic branches reaching out to overshadow "all lands." I believe that any well-disposed persons of any sect or tongue in foreign lands, that should be selected after careful examination by our Board of Missions, may be employed with peculiar advantage to extend in their own language the world-encircling missionary work of the Church.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. It is my impression that no action can be matured and perfected until another General Convention, and in the mean time this proposition will be opened to the whole Church. If it is discussed now, I fear it will occupy too much time; but I think there are ways of meeting some of the objections which have been put to this House, that might satisfy most minds. However, as these are not my resolutions, nor had I anything to do in the furthering of them, I am perfectly willing, and I hope the House will be perfectly willing, to let them go on the Journal for action at another General Convention.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. These resolutions come to us from the Board of Missions certified by their Secretary as their request to us. If the House of Bishops concur, they become a law immediately. If the House of Bishops do not concur, of course they will be null.

The Constitution of the Board of Missions is very different from ours. It is a simple thing; and this Board of Missions is composed of the working body of our Church. I think they are entitled to about as much confidence as the General Convention. They are the most active and earnest men of our Church. All they ask is now, as God's spirit has filled them, a little liberty to do that which we all desire to do, extend Christ's kingdom. They want the field open to send missionaries, teachers, physicians, and holy women.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I believe that I have as much anxiety in regard to the progress of missions as any man on this floor. I have also had as much anxiety in regard to Mexico as any man on this floor can have. But I see behind this—and I had no voice in the Board of Missions because I was not there—I see behind this a matter that I believe is a great error and a great wrong. To-day we are asked to put some missionaries in Mexico. I hope it will be done. But we have already there a gentleman of our Church who has begun work in Mexico. I have in my possession a letter from a well-known gentleman of my own Diocese, now in the city of Mexico, a candidate for orders, saying to me that the work of the Episcopal Church in the city of Mexico, and in Mexico generally, is going on partly under the Prayer-Book of the Episcopal Church, partly under prayers made by each person in his own parish or Church, partly carried on by the minis-

ters of the Church in the United States, and partly by Presbyterians, and partly by Methodists.

Now I believe that what is under this matter—I can see no other reason for this change—is that the intended Episcopate for Mexico shall be an Episcopate that will be ready to recognize workers from Methodists and from Presbyterians. I am glad to have them work there, but I am not willing that they should work in the harness of the Episcopal Church until they come into it properly; and, therefore, I object.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish to enter my protest, most earnestly, against what I conceive to be the dangerous principle put forth by the Reverend Deputy from Maryland.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I beg pardon. I thought it was an amendment to the Constitution. I find I was mistaken, and I withdraw my suggestion.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Even although his argument is withdrawn, I must press the points.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I rise to a question of order. It is manifest that this debate is entirely out of order, unless the rules are suspended, and as it is evidently to take up a large share of the time, I move that this resolution go on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Has not that point been decided in a former discussion in this House, that when a matter has been brought fairly before the House, the question has been stated and the debate commenced, it is then too late to raise such a point of order? I think it has been more than once so decided in the course of the session of this Convention.

The PRESIDENT. I do not recollect about that.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Presuming that I am right, for the general sense of the House seems to sustain me, the principle against which I wish to protest is this, that this House should ever on any matter of importance—and this question is certainly one, and the question that is to come before us soon with regard to the alteration of the Rubrics in the Prayer-Book is another—yield to the plea of letting a thing pass, that the next Convention may have it before it without our hindrance.

There are questions of alteration of the Constitution, questions of alteration of the Prayer-Book, which we are sent here to watch, and until they receive our definite approval in this Convention, and are formally proposed (which presumes the approval of this Convention) to the next, they cannot be adopted.

Now, the plausible plea is urged in this and in another case, that we shall step aside from our duty; that we shall prove false to our position as guardians and watchmen of the Church in this respect, and let the thing go by default; that when a proposition to change the Prayer-Book or the Constitution of the Church is brought before us, we should say, "There are three years to discuss it; the Church can consider it in that time, and that will leave the way open." Sir, we are not here to leave the way open. We are put here, if we see reason, to stop it, to put a bar in the way. I hope no action will be taken either in regard to points affecting the Constitution or points affecting the Prayer-Book, without the full and careful consideration of this Convention, that we shall not throw the matter over to the next Convention without our full approval.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Had not the Reverend Deputy from Rhode Island brought this subject before the House, I was prepared to do so. I was at the Board of Missions last night, and I voted against this resolution there; and it was car-

ried by a majority of only two or three, I believe. At that time, the same question which has been brought up here was, indeed, asked and answered; and whilst the answer was somewhat indefinite, it nevertheless, in my judgment, covered such a case as has been represented to us by the Reverend Deputy from Texas; and in view of this, I believe it is a subject which should be very carefully thought upon, and we should vote against this amendment at once, in order that there may come up again before us at the proper time such action as may be wished for by the Board of Missions in the proper way. The argument that fell from the Reverend Deputy from Central Pennsylvania is, I think, most timely at this time.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. I wish to say one word in regard to Mexico. The great leader in that reform movement is a friend of mine, and I can entirely disabuse the minds of brethren here, both clerical and lay, of any idea of bringing up on the same platform Methodists and Presbyterians; but, at the same time, it must be recollected that the Mexicans are principally Roman Catholics; and if former Catholic priests could be all under the control of our own Church, it would be desirable. I am somewhat acquainted with the work there. I am somewhat acquainted with the work that has been begun and somewhat carried on by our beloved brother in Mexico, who is in charge there, and I know that he loves the Church and has no desire to bring outsiders up to the same platform, though he would be very willing to have them as assistants, just as we take in our missionary organization the services of laywomen and laymen. If we could, in some way or other, extend the Episcopate there, I am sure he would be the last to throw any objection in the way. I think so from a conversation I have had with him on this subject. I believe this is a great and glorious work, that it is paralleled only by the old Reformation on the other side of the Atlantic; and I think this subject, although it has been presented to our attention at the last moment, is one which should command our attention. I hope the Convention will not tie its hands, but will consider this matter, and allow the members of this Convention and the church generally in the *interim* to think on it. No harm can be done by adopting this resolution, and I do hope that all action will not be stifled.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. Mr. President, I understand that the office of the first change is to qualify the Committee to send ladies and physicians who are now sent without any express authority of the Board, and the object of the second change is to qualify any clerical missionary to act in our foreign or other missionary jurisdictions, who shall be in the first place one of our own clergy, or next a clergyman of a Church in full communion with this Church, and in recognized official relations with it. It seems to me this is guard enough; but as that does not seem to be clear to many in the House, I move respectfully that this article be referred back to the Board of Missions for further conference to-night, and it may be presented on the morrow in another form to this House, and that the discussion on the remaining resolutions be taken up at that time.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I second the motion.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Would it not be better to refer the resolutions back to the Committee of our House, and let them present it?

Rev. Mr. LEEDS. I accept the amendment for recommitment to the Committee.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is to recommit the resolutions to the Committee on the Foreign and Domestic Missionary Society.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh, submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee of Conference, appointed to consider the disagreement between the two Houses in regard to an amendment to Section 1, of Canon 1, Title III., proposed by the House of Deputies, respectfully report that they recommend the adoption of the proposed amendment, with the alteration of the words, 'each House of the General Convention,' to 'the House of Deputies,' as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the following clause be added to Section 1, of Canon 1, of Title III., of the Digest:

"[4.] The Rules and Orders of the House of Deputies shall be in force in the ensuing General Convention until the organization thereof, and until they be amended or repealed by the said House.

"By order of the Committee on the part of the House of Bishops,

"J. WILLIAMS.

"By order of the Committee on the part of the House of Deputies,

"WM. COOPER MEAD."

The report was placed on the Calendar.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut, from the Committee on Christian Education, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Christian Education respectfully submit their report. In their efforts to make their deliberations of some practical value to the Church, your Committee have met with several difficulties:

1. Most of us are placed for the first time on this Committee, which of all others requires continuance of service, if matured thought and counsel are to be secured.

2. The lamented death of the Rev. Dr. Jackson, the late Chairman of this Committee, has deprived us of the material which he was collecting for a full report on the present state of Church education, and your Committee deeply feel the loss of his large experience and ripened judgment. Such new statistics as have been hastily brought together are insufficient to enable us to perform the promise contained in the report of 1871, viz., to "prepare a report based on a wide induction of facts which may prove of service in future consideration of the question."

3. Such suggestions as we would now make have been largely anticipated in the able reports which have preceded this, especially those presented to the General Conventions of 1865 and 1868.

4. Besides, the subject, as at present entrusted to us, without any precise limits, is comprehensive in the extreme, and reaches in its various divisions to all departments of the Church's work. We have thought it best, therefore, to confine ourselves to two or three points, which have to do with the present needs of the Church and the present duty of Churchmen.

I. OUR EXISTING INSTITUTIONS.

There are numerous Church schools for boys and girls started, chiefly by private enterprise, or the energy of some Bishop, assisted by the munificence of one or more of the laity. Most of them are without endowment, and are dependent upon the character and exertions of those who have them in charge. They live by the day, on what is received for board and tuition, and have no reserve funds for building purposes, repairs, increase of libraries, and other educational equipments. The income of their teachers is proportioned to the amount of patronage received. The number of free scholars is measured by the ability rather than by the will or the wishes

of those who manage their affairs. There are no endowed scholarships provided for the sons and daughters of the clergy, and other deserving youth, or, at least, so few as to do little towards meeting the demand. Nearly all these schools—even the most prosperous—are hindered in their work by this dependent condition. They are compelled, in the majority of instances, to practise the costly economy of poverty. If those who are doing the work have any true ideal of what Christian culture is, and what kind of education in the Church our times require, they must be painfully conscious how inadequate are the means at their disposal, to attain the desired results. It is plain that we cannot have forty or fifty Etons or Rugbys. Great endowments, a full supply of distinguished and experienced masters, suitable buildings and appliances, the traditions of permanence, are not the growth of a day. We do not need, at present, to multiply, to any great extent, our schools of the highest grade. They are numerically almost sufficient, and no mistake can be greater than to divide and scatter our force. One thoroughly good school will accomplish far more for Christian education than a dozen inferior ones. Your Committee believe that the true policy of the Church is to concentrate our energy, ability, and endowments upon the institutions which we have, and which already have secured a measure of success, to increase their resources, add scholarships, provide them with all needful appliances, and thus make them, so far as we can do it, strong and permanent. If the Church provides the best schools for training the young, though they be comparatively few, they will always be full to overflowing, and the Church will be the gainer thereby.

There is need, however, especially in Dioceses where the Church is feeble, of a much larger provision for Christian Education which shall be within the reach of the great body of the people. The various religious denominations, the Roman Catholic in particular, have established cheap boarding schools in large numbers, which draw in the sons and daughters of the less wealthy classes—that is, the large majority of the people, the classes which, in this land, supply our leading men in Church and State. For such schools we must depend principally upon endowments and scholarships at least in the beginning, and they must be administered by persons who have devoted their lives to the work not for gain, but simply and solely to advance the interests of the Kingdom of Christ in this world.

II. SUPPLY OF TEACHERS.

One great difficulty in the way of providing schools which can do the Church's work at a moderate cost, arises from the very inadequate supply of competent teachers, male and female, who make teaching their calling with the true motive. Many can be found who will undertake to impart instruction for a high salary. Many young men fresh from college, without experience, are willing to teach a year or two in order that they may obtain means of support while studying for a profession. But there are very few who consecrate their best years and their highest powers and their undivided energy to this service, meaning to teach earthly things in such a spirit that those entrusted to their care may be led toward heavenly things; who in this work expect a bare support, looking for other recompense than the world can give. And yet these are the teachers the Church needs, men and women of superior ability, and culture who have learned in their daily toil to keep steadily in view the eternal results. How shall this want be supplied? There are one or two suggestions which your Committee would make in answer to this question.

Many men and women are employed at present in

schools, academies, and colleges which have no connection with the Church. Their experience and scholarship, if called to the same work under the higher auspices, would be of great value. There might be also a far greater use of woman's help in this field of labor. Many a cultivated woman would give her time and talents to teaching if the way were opened to her, and she were called by the proper authorities to the work. The heads of schools and colleges should be urged to keep this deficiency in mind, and to direct their efforts toward providing well-trained men and women who will enter upon teaching with enthusiasm as their mission for life.

But the great want will not be met until some method of organization be adopted, such as brotherhoods or sisterhoods, whose members make teaching their special work, and who therefore cultivate the teaching faculty and acquire all the branches of useful learning in order to do Christ's work for the young, under the direction and at the call of their Bishops and Pastors. And while an organized work seems to be the only one likely to meet our necessities, and while the religious motive is the only one powerful enough to draw men and women to such work for the best years of their lives, it should be borne in mind that the truths of the Gospel, and the Catholic faith, as this Church hath received the same, have strength and vitality sufficient to furnish motive and method to such associations without exaggerations or additions in doctrine or practice—and without borrowing distinctive dress, nomenclature, or usages, from the Church of Rome. In some of the schools or colleges at present belonging to us, such associations might be developed—teaching orders—Brothers of the Christian Doctrine—Sisters of the Holy Childhood—composed of men and women of sound judgment, moral force, thorough education, patient and winning ways, who would ask for no higher work than to train the minds and mould the characters of the young in accordance with the gracious teachings of the Church, and with the sanction of, and in loyal submission to, the authority of those who are rulers in the same.

COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

In regard to collegiate education, we ask, Ought the Church to provide this, or are our youth to pursue their higher studies, liberal and scientific, in institutions which are under no religious influence, or such as is adverse to Church principles? If it is worth while to have our own colleges at all—if we hold that religion is the foundation of all knowledge—then it is clear that there is a great failure of duty among Churchmen. Noble work has been done and is now going forward in the few colleges which we can call our own; but the popular current sets the other way, and there is a lack among ourselves of cordial support of these institutions. This is proved by the small number of undergraduates which they contain, and the disproportion between the endowments and other resources of our colleges and the great work which they have in hand. It is not possible for a few earnest and able men to perform this work alone. They need the hearty and consistent support of all intelligent Churchmen. In nine Colleges belonging to or under the influence of the Church, the whole number of undergraduates is only 543. In the same number of Colleges other than Church Colleges, there are 418 Churchmen. In one New England College, under Congregational influence, there are 65 Churchmen; and in a single University in the State of New York, which disclaims any theological bias, there are 90. These facts are significant. If education without the Gospel is unblest, and if the Church is the true educator, the witness and keeper of all

truth, secular as well as religious, then a grievous wrong is committed by Churchmen when they divert the patronage and gifts which ought to go to our own colleges to those institutions which are out of our control, and in some cases under no religious influence of any kind. While we call the attention of our brethren to the great mistake of not patronizing and cherishing our own colleges, we would at the same time earnestly enforce the reasonable duty of making our own schools and colleges so perfectly fitted to afford the very best training, that they may justly claim support on this ground alone.

There is another point of great importance in connection with this subject to which the Committee would call your attention.

In most of our old institutions the course of studies has been changed or enlarged, chiefly on account of the rapid advance in science and invention. In some, scientific schools have been added with a distinct programme, mainly in physical science and practical art. In these scientific and technological schools, the physical and practical, being of visible utility, threaten to drown out the æsthetical and ethical, and ardent young men longing to take their places and use their arms in the great arena of life pursue the attractive and immediately applicable courses. Thus the old moral teachings are brought to the test of physical experiment. Some of the most skilful teachers of physics sneer at the Bible, and while we may hope the danger is far less in those institutions which are under the control of the Church, still even in these we must be on our guard against the drift of the age. What we need in all our colleges is able Christian professors. In our chairs of moral science, including Christian ethics and Christian evidences, men *au courant* with the advance of physical science, able to expose every falsehood and fallacy, to answer all the questions of enquiring youth, and to set forth and defend the ground of their faith to their students with the help of science itself. The first question to be asked in regard to every applicant for the post of professor, tutor, or master in any Church institution should be this: Is he a devout Christian man in his belief and practice? No literary or scientific qualification can possibly compensate for the lack of Christian influence, example, and precept.

It would be well if those who are actually engaged in the work of Church education could meet from time to time and confer together on the above and kindred subjects. It seems to your Committee that there ought to be in each Diocese a committee on Christian education, appointed by its Convention, to whom the promotion of this cause should be especially entrusted, and to whom persons in the Diocese, engaged in the work of teaching, or desirous of engaging in it, could be referred by the Bishop. With these Diocesan Committees, this Committee, if a Standing Committee of the General Convention, could communicate in preparing future reports, and thus a full view could be more readily obtained and presented to the Church, of the present and prospective condition of her educational work.

In regard to the immeasurable importance of Christian education your Committee are of one mind. The heart and conscience of the Church need to be quickened that our duty to our own baptised youth—and to the youth of this land—may be performed to the utmost of our powers; that the downward tendencies of a godless education, worldliness, and vice and infidelity, may be stayed, and that, exercising in full faith the "Divine instrumentalities committed to our trust," our sons may grow up as the young plants, and that our daughters may be as the polished corners of the Temple.

Your Committee would recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the members of the Church be again most earnestly reminded of their sacred duty to uphold the schools and colleges which are under Church direction and influence."

"Resolved, That it be recommended to every Diocese to appoint a Standing Committee of Christian Education, which may communicate with this Committee of the General Convention, collect the statistics of Church education, and of other educational work in the Diocese, and adopt such measures as may be most feasible for supplying teachers and for promoting the efficiency and permanence of our own institutions."

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Christian Education be continued, that they may have time to deliberate and mature a Report on Education, to be presented at the next General Convention, which may prove of service in the further consideration of the subject."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Rev. HENRY A. COIT, D.D.
Rev. CHAS. MINNIGERODE, D.D.
Rev. ALDERT SMEDES, D.D.
Rev. GEORGE BECKETT, D.D.
Rev. EDWIN E. JOHNSON.
Rev. GILES A. EASTON.
Mr. NATHANIEL H. R. DAWSON.
Mr. HENRY COPPEE, LL.D.
Mr. CHARLES J. JENKINS, LL.D.
Mr. ISAAC ATWATER.

The resolutions reported were adopted unanimously.

SPANISH PRAYER-BOOK.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York, from the Special Committee to report a version of the Book of Common Prayer in Spanish, submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee appointed at the last General Convention to report a version of the Book of Common Prayer in the Spanish language ask leave to report:

"That although, owing to the fact that the members of the Committee were so widely scattered, any joint action has been a matter of considerable difficulty, yet the proposed version has been begun on the basis of an existing version, and some progress has been made. The Committee therefore ask to be continued.

"(Signed)

J. WILLIAMS,
H. POTTER,
W. D. WILSON,
BENJ. STARK."

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. I merely wish to remark that, in consequence of the fact stated in the report, but little progress has been made, not so much as it might have been expected would be accomplished. I am now happy to state that under a reorganization of the Committee, and under special arrangements now in our power and at our command, we hope to be able to make a rapid and more satisfactory progress. I move therefore that the Committee be continued, and that the President be instructed to fill vacancies on the part of this House.

The motion was agreed to.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. It seems to me that the time has arrived when the matter of the hour of final adjournment should be agreed upon, and in order to elicit the judgment of the House on the subject—

OFFICE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The PRESIDENT. The time has come for the special order of the day fixed for 11 o'clock—the report in regard to the baptismal service.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I ask the Secretary to read the report.

The Secretary read as follows :

"The Committee on Canons have had under careful consideration the Memorials coming from more than five hundred of the clergy of this Church, and a very large number of vestries and other laymen, together with the nearly unanimous action of one of the largest Dioceses, praying for some relaxation of the Rubrics in the Office for Infant Baptism, as granted in a former age in case of the Apostles' Creed, which tended to the peace of the Church, without altering its doctrine or perceptibly its practice.

"In view of the number and character of the petitioners, it is deemed reasonable at least, if not their due, that their petition should be so far responded to as to put it in the power of the General Convention to extend the desired relief, if in its judgment the best interests of the Church should so require.

"The Committee, therefore, without being understood to pledge any of its members upon the vote thereon, do submit for the action of the House the following resolutions :

"1. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be, and hereby is, proposed to add as a Rubric at the end of the Office for Infant Baptism the words following, viz. :

"The minister may, at his discretion, omit the exhortation preceding the Lord's Prayer in the above Office, and in place of the Thanksgiving substitute the Collect for Easter Even. This Rubric, however, is not to be construed as implying any change in the doctrine of the Church.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Secretary of the House of Deputies cause the proposed Rubric to be made known to the Dioceses, as required by the Constitution and Canons."

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. It will be observed, Mr. President—and I wish to call special attention to it—that no proposition is made to change anything at the present time, or to change the doctrine of the Prayer-Book at all. It is only asked that this subject be referred to the Dioceses to be acted upon three years hence ; and it is also to be understood that no man commits himself to the final vote, because as in 1856, when at the request of a number of parties a proposition for the establishment of an appellate court was asked for by its friends, to be referred to the next General Convention, it was done almost by unanimous consent, whereas in 1859 that proposition failed by a very large majority. It may be so in the present case. No man asserts anything by voting for this present proposition. That is understood in the Committee on Canons, and I am perfectly willing and desire that it should be so understood by the House.

If this were a new subject, it would be easily disposed of. But, unfortunately, it is an old subject, and not only an old subject, but one productive of controversy, voluminous, protracted and intense beyond anything which has plagued the Church since the Reformation.

In fact, no part of the Church Catholic has been so much disturbed by the question of Baptism as ours has been. The Greek, Roman Catholic and Non-Episcopal churches are all at peace among themselves respecting it, while we are in perpetual strife, as we have long been, and the prospect anything but encouraging ; and all growing out of the peculiar structure of our office for Infant Baptism.

A venerable clergyman, to whom General Conventions have long been indebted for learning and wis-

dom in council, said to me a few months ago : "I am old and shall not live to attend more than one more General Convention, but such is my conviction of the hindrance which this office has proved to our Church, that I cannot leave the Church or leave the world without leaving upon record in some shape or other my testimony respecting it ;" and but for sickness which precedes the end he would have been here to-day at the head of the Deputation from Pennsylvania, and you would have been listening to his voice instead of mine. Would to God I were able to speak as he would have spoken, and if I ever coveted abilities with which nature has not endowed me it is in pleading before you a cause which is so intimately connected with the prosperity of the Church of our common love.

Coming before us in its present shape, at the instance of one of the largest Dioceses—the historic Diocese in which the Church was first planted in this country—a Diocese acting in its official capacity by a vote of its Convention of one hundred and fifty (including both its Bishops) to fourteen, yet withal so conservative and with such careful regard even to the prejudices of others, as you have heard. This alone, I am confident, will ensure for it here the most respectful consideration.

But this is not all. Petitions of like tenor are before us from every quarter of the Church ; which, considering the number and character of the petitions, have not been equalled by any hitherto presented to this body.

In an experience of a quarter of a century in this House, no one thing has been asked of it which, in my judgment, could be granted with so little sacrifice on the part of any, and which at the same time would be received with so much thankfulness and do so much good.

Nothing could prove such an end of controversy, nothing so arrest a spreading discontent within and disarm assailants from without, and promote a hearty union among ourselves for the work to which the Lord has called us, as the granting by the majority, or supposed majority, the consideration now asked of it for the minority, or supposed minority, so far exceeding in numbers and power its proportionate representation here.

And what reasons can there be against granting the liberty desired ? If any ask what reasons there be for it, I can answer that question in a manner which no man can misunderstand.

It is desired by three classes. The first class consists of those who believe that now the word "regenerate," when it occurs in the Baptismal office, teaches a doctrine contrary to the Word of God, and therefore their conscience is sore distressed in using it ; which I take as evidence, not of a weak conscience, but of a strong conscience ; for it is a weak conscience which either does not concern itself about such questions, or which can pronounce as the mouthpiece of the Church, yet which personally it believes to be false.

And though I do not belong to this class, I hold that their petition ought to be granted ; for it is a great hardship and wrong either to enforce or enact a law compelling men upon pain of extrusion from the ministry, to say that which they believed to be contrary to the will of God, unless it can be shown not only that they have mistaken the will of God, but also that the enforced word is essential to a valid baptism, which no man pretends ; and if the Broad Church party will confine itself to points like that, it is bound, sooner or later, to prevail.

The second class consists of those who have no difficulty about reconciling the office to Scripture, being able as they conceive to demonstrate that the hypothetical theory of its interpretation is the true one, as in the case of the Burial office, but are yet strenuous for its revision, or some legal relaxation in

its use, on account of its extreme liability to perversion, as its whole history shows.

This liability to perversion six out of the seven of the principal schools of interpretation (or five of the six, if my generous opponent from Wisconsin prefers it), are forced to admit, holding as they do, that each of the seven except its own *has*, in point of fact, perverted it; or, though honestly trying to find the true meaning, have not been able. It is on this ground that I am so strongly with the petitioners, not only because it has been made to teach error so extensively (as it did not for at least the first half century of its history), but of late more than ever.

The leader of the Romish party in England, Dr. Pusey, says of the regeneration effected by baptism, "No change of heart or of the affections, no repentance, however radical, no faith, no love, came up to the idea of this birth from above. It is the creation of a new heart, new affections, new desires," etc.—a statement more bold and contrary to the Bible than I can find in any Roman Catholic writer—and yet he declares for himself and party in these and other extreme opinions, "We have made our way by the Prayer-Book."

This of course we believe they have not done honestly; but I do not wish to be ever disentangling the web of sophistry by which such monstrous conclusions are reached, but which are being continually circulated among our people.

I do not wish, when using the Baptismal Office, now being more generally scrutinized and censured than ever, to be obliged to explain as if there were two kinds of regeneration, or read the Bishops' Declaration, or notice the fallacious distinction recently set up in theology, between being begotten of the Spirit and being born of the Spirit, in order that our Church may not be unjustly censured.

And I trust no one will think it a sufficient answer to this objection to say that the Bible may be perverted too, instituting a parallel between the unalterable and perfect work of God with the imperfect and alterable work of man. It is no answer at all, but only an evasion. The class petitioning for liberty on these grounds is numerous and daily increasing.

The third class consists of those holding different theories themselves, yet believe the request of the petitioners, upon one ground or another, to be reasonable, and ought to be granted—an example of Christian charity which, if generally followed, and working both ways, would be the forerunner of peace throughout all our borders.

We come, then, to these objections or supposed objections. What are they? One will have no change without regard to what change may be proposed, but simply for no change's sake, and calls it conservatism.

I must say that I sympathize with this party. It is not common with old Conservatives of my time of life to desire change. But upon a question like this history and common sense are entitled to a hearing.

There was an antecedent probability touching all works of this sort, that in the course of time they would require change.

Lord Bacon, and every philosopher of note, recognizes this principle. And there is no human composition extant, except the Prayer-Book, so voluminous and covering so many subjects, civil or ecclesiastical, having the force of law, which has not within three hundred years been changed again and again to keep pace with altered facts or other necessities, and none has suffered more from such readjustment being too long delayed.

But even the Prayer-Book has been obliged to yield once and again to this necessity. Public opinion in England would no longer endure the denunciatory political prayers of the State services,

and they were abolished a few years since. The Lectionary is lately revised, and there is a general demand for a revision of the Rubrics and for shorter services, and where this will stop, or ought to stop, does not appear and ought not to be asked. God has constituted not only the world, but the Church, on its human side, upon the principle of progression—not of revolution or of innovation, but of progression in its highest and noblest sense, and to fight against this principle is to fight against God. And surely a glance at the history of the Church will be sufficient to establish the proposition. Look at from Abraham to David, and from David to the carrying away to Babylon, and from the carrying away to Babylon to the Advent, and from the Advent to this day—never stationary—in no two ages alike, and yet, as to its essential being, ever in all ages one and the same. A true conservatism, if it does not yield too soon, does not resist too long.

No change! Why, sir, in the apprehensions of men the fundamental principles of *morals* are undergoing continual change.

Look at the Old Testament saints. Look at the Fathers of the Church, the great Augustine included, in so many respects "bright patterns of the Christian life"—it is impossible to deny the evidence that, if they did not forge miracles, they endorsed those which they knew to be forged. They had not learned the sin of doing evil that good might come. Look at Theodosius, the pride of the Church, guilty of crimes which no Turkish Sultan would now dream of committing.

For the indiscriminate murder of 15,000 people, men, women, and children, the great St. Ambrose was thought a wonder of discipline for suspending the Emperor from the Communion for a few Sundays.

And look at the wars instigated by the Popes of Rome, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as wicked in their inception and as savage in their conduct as any ever waged by Goths and Vandals.

No change! How long since persecution unto death for opinion's sake was thought necessary by the best of men?

And much later still—two generations after the Prayer-Book was made—see the head of the Church, in the person of James I., helping to torture, with his own hand, a wretched victim of superstition, whom he charged with raising a tempest by which he was near being drowned on his return from Denmark.

And thousands all over Europe, after horrible tortures, were executed for witchcraft according to the then reigning public opinion, shared in by the great and good Chief Justice Hale, the sainted Baxter, and the last revisers of the Prayer-Book. All agreed that such executions were necessary—Catholic and Protestant, Churchman and Puritan. They were all in darkness.

Such was the Church in this thing, and at so recent a day; and there is no greater error than in looking for its perfection in the past instead of the future.

The doctrine, then, of historical development, *i.e.*, the development not of truth itself, but of the apprehension of it in the mind of the Church, is a true doctrine, and must go on until creeds and offices, Canons and Rubrics, touching faith and morals, doctrine, and discipline, shall perfectly coincide with Holy Scripture.

And surely our Ritualistic brethren will not object to change upon the score of principle, for they are compelled to go much further, and hold, with Mr. Newman, to objective development, or the power of the Church to develop the body of truth itself, which though, as Mr. Newman foresaw, is a far safer basis on which to

found the pretensions of Rome as it is, than the doctrine of "stability," viz., that their whole system is contained in the Bible, yet it is a fearful thing to begin with, for by it, once begun in the direction taken at Trent, and long before, Rome was bound, of logical necessity, to land in the blasphemous decree of 1870.

But admitting this to be true, the second class objects—"I do not want any change or revision of the Prayer-Book, and will not hear of it." But I, for one, do not wish you to hear of it. I am as much opposed to revision as you are. What is revision? Our version of the Bible is now being revised; and how? Chapter by chapter and verse by verse, for correction as need shall appear—a work which, in the judgment of the most learned, conservative, and orthodox of the English world, time had rendered absolutely necessary; and yet, for years, what an ignorant outcry was raised against it!

And has not the Prayer-Book too been revised time and again, and in this sense? Upon its fourth or fifth revision in 1662, after the failure of the obstructive of the Savoy Conference, the Convocation took up the work and made some six hundred alterations [so says Dr. Blakeney; I have not verified the statement], most of them small and for the letter, but some of them very important, and leaving the book on the whole more Protestant than it was before. And it is no more than just to those revisers to say that, little qualified as some of them were for their office, they never dreamed that their work was to be final, or that they were fixing formularies for all time, but distinctly contemplated future revisions as likely to become necessary.

And pray what has been the history of all Church formularies from the beginning but a history of revision, from the three Creeds in their rudimentary state which through centuries were revised again and again, and never ceased to be revised so long as any doubt about their meaning remained, and their object was secured.

But revision is not asked for, and no man is more opposed than I am to opening the book to any commission for that purpose. If any man or party have a proposition to make, let it come up singly and upon its own merits; and, after suitable time for reflection, I shall be ready to vote upon it. If in favor of it, it will be because I think it just and reasonable, and that it ought to be conceded. If against it, it will be because, upon its own merits, I think it ought not to be granted, and not from the pusillanimous apprehension of "entering wedges," and because, if granted, something else may possibly be asked, holding myself ready to consider such possible thing in the same way, without being so afraid of doing harm as not to do good.

The Diocese of Virginia does not ask a single line of the Prayer-Book to be changed. Nor does any one. The Diocese of Virginia only asks liberty for those who desire it to omit a word, not essential to a valid baptism, which has never settled anything, never will settle anything, and everybody knows it, and which all experience shows had better be left optional.

But the third class replies: "This is the very thing which I will not grant." But why, I ask, in the name of all that is reasonable and kind—why? How can you defend yourself as towards your brethren for such refusal, unless it can be shown that in some way or other a revealed doctrine about Infant Baptism would be injured by any concession whatever from the particular form now in use? And if so, what doctrine is it? Can any one tell?—for there is certainly no agreement about it.

In the first place, what does the word "regenerate" mean in the "Service"? I say, a moral change. The Catechism settles that question: "A

death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness"—for can there be "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness" without a moral change? No wonder that those who, forced by the exigencies of their theories, must try to make some distinction between them, resort to subtleties which confuse the minds of their readers and their own.

Not only the Prayer-Book uses the word "regeneration" in the sense of a moral change, but the Homilies, Hooker, and nearly every great writer, until about the opening of the eighteenth century; so that Waterland and others, who charge the identification of regeneration with a moral change upon the Puritans, are themselves chargeable with the novelty, as so clearly shown in the latest and most elaborate work written upon the Prayer-Book.

But as to this regeneration actually taking place in or by baptism, this is supposed or a hypothesis, like the faith which the infant (not the sponsor) by hypothesis professes. So that faith and regeneration as antecedent and consequent go together in the Prayer-Book as in Scripture, and all is well.

But no, says a learned divine, writing to me a few days ago, "there are objections to that theory of interpretation. I see flaws in it." "I admit it" (was my reply), "and you can attack it if you please, but beware how you set up one of your own. The difference between you and me is this—you see flaws in my theory which I admit, and I see chasms in yours which you deny." But what kind of a change is it which the Office "determines"? A moral change? No, say the Bishops, which is undoubtedly true, and as great a step in the direction of peace as it was of truth. The truth is, the office is not entirely consistent with itself on any theory of interpretation, as the advocates of each do virtually confess by their labors to reduce the more stubborn parts to harmony. That there is some ambiguity must be admitted by all who have followed its conduct through the English courts of law. We admit that the book as a whole is imperfect, but insist that each particular part is just as it should be, giving occasion to the taunt of the Romanist—"Our Church cannot err—yours never does."

Nor is this the worst of it—each gloss put upon the Office becomes a glass through which the beholder looks at Scripture, seeing meanings in texts which, but for his theory, never would have been thought of. How has Scripture suffered at the hands of theorists! What sad work of it is made—e.g., by Mr. Sadler. So we see thousands led to believe that the Bible teaches unconditional probation, *de arbitrio*, because the Westminster Confession rules, Rom. ix., to teach that doctrine.

So it is that the compulsory use of this Office—word for word—is becoming more and more a stumbling block. As to the fact, no man can fail to see it or how it works. Let me illustrate: A man builds a fine residence, but by some means or other a big stone is left in the road leading to it, which, after a while, becomes a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. Complaints are made; but the proprietor is conservative, and will not allow it to be removed. And when accidents occur he says, "Go over it, or go round it, but it shall not be removed." Accidents becoming more numerous, he says, "Put up sign-boards." Then, "hang up lights about it," when each for his personal safety hangs up his own; and there are red lights, green lights, blue lights—when in the confusion which ensues there are more accidents than ever. The proprietor is entreated and remonstrated with—What good has come of this stone? How much better other proprietors get on who have nothing of the sort! He only gets angry, and becomes

more conservative than before. But finally another occupant comes into possession, and takes away stone, sign-boards, lights, and all. The trouble is ended, and the former proprietor only gets into history—a case for metaphysical philosophers to cite in proof of their theories.

So of this Baptismal Office. Look at its explainers, and see, have they not made a work of it? See the numerous and conflicting guides who offer themselves to its understanding, crying, "Lo here, and lo there!"—the lights hung up. I see divers here who have hung them up. I have hung up one; our Chairman, I think, two. The Bishops hung up a great light, a very Drummond, casting its beams far and wide, and showing—what? In their opinion upon a single point, what is not—something to be indeed thankful for—but upon no point what is.

Meanwhile controversies and loss go on increasing. In Baptist neighborhood, which abound in the South shrewd disputants get hold of the Office, our people are unable to answer them, become unsettled in their minds, and decline to have their children baptized at all. This too is the initial point at which the work of secession has begun. A Bishop tells me that he has never known one to be perverted by this means, but unfortunately I have. I know these men better than the Bishop does.

One of the greatest minds in the country left our ministry solely on account of the Baptismal Office, as I had it from his own mouth, and confirmed by Bishop McIlvaine, who displaced him.

Speaking of Bishop McIlvaine, it was at his earnest request that I attended the Radical Conference at Chicago some years ago. The burden of debate was this Baptismal Office.

I had a long argument with one to whom the Bishop was much attached, an humble-minded, devout man, born in the Church, but in vain. He said when he came to the words "seeing now that this child regenerate," he could not pronounce them. He admitted the hypothesis, but said it was not understood, and that, in point of fact, error was taught. He went out, and it was with sorrow of heart on both sides that a man was deposed with whom the Bishop wished his soul to be gathered; but the law gave no chance—so it was supposed. The modest man gave no trouble of a trial. The Bishop was then in conflict with the Romanizers in his Diocese, who watched for his halting in discipline. The result was that he who held cordially all the Church's real doctrine went out, while those who were hostile to it staid in.

In Illinois, both parties happened to be of a different temper, but we all know that the sole trouble there was about this Office. Take the other seceders. I know well those of them who have given most character to the movement, and in every case it was this Office, and this alone, which started them.

Will any one then say, taking the whole case into review, that there is no evil accruent to call for any relaxation, as asked by the petitioners? Are there indeed no serious disputes, no ecclesiastical trials, depositions, actions of councils, actions of the nine Bishops, and declarations of them all?

I believe if this declaration could have been issued five years ago and appended to the Office, put upon a candlestick where it could be seen, and the liberty now asked have been granted, the agitation of the past year would never have taken place. But a break having been made, if all relaxation in this direction is refused, and nonconformists promptly punished, can any one say that no further or more extensive disaffection will ensue? Some say, "Let them go—who cares?" I, for one, care most deeply.

But one says, if you attempt to stop the Ritualists, or even grant this relaxation, they will secede.

To this answer, nothing better could happen to us. They do not love our Church. The leaders say they do not just so far as it is Protestant, and nothing can make them love it or submit to its discipline.

When charged with this even by High Churchmen, they become angry. But when charged with the same by Roman Catholics, nay, with dishonesty, in cutting sarcasm, for retaining their place, they submit to their insults with a meekness which is truly edifying. The sooner therefore they leave, the better it will be for the Protestant Church; better for their own salvation.

On the whole, with this petition granted and the negative pregnant of the Bishops, we have the best practicable settlement of the question, unless, indeed, the Office could be recast in simpler form, involving no theory and capable of no theory about the effect of baptism upon the soul of an infant. Children would then be just as effectually and more generally baptized, and then Waterland and Goode, Phillpotts and Gorham, and Pusey, and Mozley, and Blakeney, with a thousand lesser tractates, "The Incarnation and New Birth," "Birth and New Birth," with the "Seven Theories," might be consigned to the catacombs of literature—for in so far as they undertake to propound any theory of the effect of baptism upon the soul of an infant, they have no connection with Scripture, even by the most attenuated thread of inference, and are a mass of speculation.

But this controversy off our hands, with the noble and unprecedented work accomplished in this Convention of 1874, ever to be memorable in the history of the Church, we can give all our energies to the work of evangelization, and united endeavors to arrest the tide of corruption, perjury, and fraud setting in upon the political and commercial world, threatening the dissolution of society, and this in presence of the Church sitting in grave debate upon genuflections and colored stoles (but now—devoutest thanks to God—no longer) when called with trumpet-voice from heaven to bring the moral powers of the Gospel to bear down upon the kingdom of sin, Satan, and death.

In summing up for the petitioners, allow me to say that it seems reasonable that their prayer should be granted—

1. As an act of Christian charity to so many in the Church, than whom none know more of it, are more devoted to it, or have done more for it, unless it can be shown to be against some part of the Bible doctrine of Infant Baptism.

2. Because that, in point of fact, this Office has to so great an extent failed to teach what its framers intended it to teach, and has proved available for teaching so much which certainly they did not intend it to teach, and because without the proposed relaxation in its use it is manifest to all observers of the current of controversy it will become more and more a stumbling block and occasion to fall in a brother's way—on the one hand into a schism, on the other into erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word—inasmuch that, in view of the whole case, the duty as well as the wisdom of the Church could not be plainer if a voice were heard from Heaven saying, *take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people.*

I close as I began. I ask that this may at least be referred to the Church, to be considered for three years. Then will be time enough for the final argument and final vote, and no man in the meantime need be troubled. I can hardly doubt the result. I look in the eye of my brother from Wisconsin [Rev. Dr. Adams], and I feel that he too will accede to this request.

Rev. DR. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. By no means.
[The time to which speeches are limited having

arrived during the delivery of the remarks of Rev. Dr. Andrews, his time was, on motion, extended.]

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Mr. President—I have asked the opportunity at an early stage of this debate to present you my own individual views. As a member of the Committee on Canons, I was not present in the Committee when the matter was discussed and finally voted on, the result of which vote was the presentation of the report which has been read to you. If I had been present, I should have there voted against it for the reasons which I shall proceed, briefly as I can, to give you.

I do not intend to discuss the questions which have been raised before you theologically. I wish to say nothing with regard to the Baptismal Service in itself, even to give you what my own opinion upon it is as a matter of doctrine. I am afraid, in the presence of so many learned theologians, and of some from whom I have been accustomed to receive the doctrine of the Church, to discuss theology, for fear that I might find myself talking heresy before I knew it.

But this question, as it is now before us, is a practical one; and the first objection which I have to the measure is that the whole report is founded, as I think, upon a fallacy, which is, that this Convention, without approving a proposition, may present it for final agreement to a succeeding General Convention. I utterly disagree with any such principle. I believe that if we act upon such a principle we shall not be true to our constitutional duty. The Constitution, if it means anything, prescribes that before an alteration shall be made in the Prayer-Book, it shall have the approval of two General Conventions, and we have no right to shirk the question in the first General Convention, and say, "Instead of approving this, we will throw the whole responsibility on the next General Convention, and let them have the right, by a single vote, to change the Prayer-Book which has been entrusted to us as a sacred trust"; and therefore, if I were in favor of this proposition, I would vote for it; but, as I am opposed to it, with the lights which are now before me, I shall vote against it; and I think it the duty of every member of this House, when this proposition is placed before him, to vote either "yea" or "nay," according as he approves or disapproves the proposed change.

The next objection which I have to the proposition in itself is that it is not asked for by the persons whose consciences appear to be affected by the use of this phrase. It is asked for, as I understand, by sympathizing brethren who wish to remove a cause of offence to others who are weaker than themselves. If we had here a petition from certain clergymen who say that they cannot use that Baptismal Service conscientiously, that if it be insisted on by the Church, if we conclude persistently to keep it there, they will have to leave the Church, it would present a very different question, especially if they added, which I think they would not add, that if this change be made they will then remain loyal and faithful to the Prayer-Book, and accept all else that it contains *ex animo and ex corde*. Now, we have no such proposition presented to us. We have simply a petition from a most respectable number of our clergymen and laymen asking for this relief, as the most of them will tell you, for others than themselves. We have yet to hear of a single individual who comes here and says, "I cannot use that myself conscientiously"; and, therefore, believing as I do that the adoption of this change will not produce the effect which is claimed for it, that it will be simply an entering wedge to a demand for other changes, and that if we go on as we are now beginning we shall not have the Prayer-Book just as the Reformed Church adopted it, agreeing to

yield to the conscientious convictions of these weaker brethren, I am opposed *ab initio and in limine* to making any change whatever by special legislation.

That does not mean, however, that I am opposed absolutely to this change. The Committee on Canons have reported, and it has been made the order of the day, I believe, for to-day at twelve o'clock, a resolution on the whole question of Rubrical revision. I supported that with my whole heart. I believe that is the true remedy. I believe that if a commission take up that question, they will undoubtedly take into consideration this proposed change, and I would join in a resolution recommending such change to the consideration of such commission, and let them in their wisdom consider it; and if, as a part of the whole, they can recommend it to us for adoption, I do not pledge myself now to favor it, but it will certainly receive my most careful and deliberate examination, and I believe that I should go for it; but only as a part of a whole, for the same reason that if this change had been made when our Rubrics were established, I would never go for putting the clause in as it now stands, but I would leave it as I found it, just as I am disposed to leave it as I find it now, until a general Rubrical revision shall be made. If we receive the assent of that commission to a revision as a whole, and if this is in it, I shall, probably, not oppose it.

But it is said that if we make this change we shall prevent a great many from leaving us, just as a great many have left us, and that possibly we may get back those who have left. Now, if I understand anything of the recent movement which was made from the Church, it was not from a belief that the doctrine of the Church is very wrong, because the doctrine is now just as it was when those brethren entered the fold, but because they believed that though the doctrine was there, yet that this Church was drifting in the wrong direction. They felt alarmed; they believed that there was so strong a current in this Church of advancement that they were not safe in remaining here, and they had to leave the ship before she sunk! Now, sir, whatever may have been their opinions three months ago, or I may almost say three days ago, they can with no face now come forward and say that this Church is drifting in the direction which they said she was. Take the two leading votes which have been taken in this House since we met, and what do they show? Do they show advanced Ritualism? I trow not. If it mean anything, it means what I have heard said, that this Church has been bound hand and foot, and handed over to our Low Church brethren.

But the change is argued for another reason, that it is so small a change that it amounts to nothing. It is not necessary for me here to remind the gentlemen before me that the change of a single letter, an iota, showed the difference between the deadliest heresy that has ever attacked this Church and the orthodox faith, which we now have as the heritage which has been handed down to us. The danger of the change consists, as I said before, in that it is an entering wedge. It is special legislation. It is legislating to meet a particular case. When a danger has been shown, when an offence has been committed, when there is reason to apprehend a coming danger, then I am willing to meet it by special legislation; but when that legislation is simply to meet an idea, not anything new, but what, if it exists, has existed throughout the whole history of the Church, then I am opposed to meeting any such danger by special legislation; but let us meet it, if we can, by that general remedy which this Committee has reported, and which I believe, from the unanimity in which

it was acceded to in our Committee, will meet with the like unanimity in this House.

I believe, Mr. President, I have said all that in the limited time that is allowed I have now to say. I therefore yield the floor.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish to say in regard to the alleged matter of disquiet in this Church, that when I received the postal card that was sent, I suppose, to all the clergy of the Church, I could not but feel in my heart that the three distinguished men who signed that postal card, or whose names were attached to it, and put it forth, were disquieting the Church much more than the Prayer-Book. I felt that they were, with the prestige of their position, their age, their names, their ability, sending this out broadcast among the clergy, knowing very well that a large number of the clergy are in an isolated position, with but little opportunity to consult with their brethren; and this appeal comes, not that these gentlemen desire the change for their own comfort, for their own happiness, for their own quiet, but they desire it because all over the Church there is such a feeling of disquiet in using the Baptismal Service that, therefore, they ask you to put your name to this postal card. Now, I maintain that there is no such extensive disquiet throughout the Church at all; it cannot be sustained, for, as the gentleman who has just preceded me has very well said, the number of names is no evidence of this disquiet, as it is termed, and distress over this subject. In the last Convention of the Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, before this postal card was put out, the most extreme Low Churchman in that Diocese, an intimate and beloved friend of mine, volunteered, of his own accord, to say to me that he was entirely opposed to even an alternate phrase in the Service for the Baptism of Infants, that he felt that if that was allowed it would bring discontent and disorder into our parishes. And let me ask, if this postal card business of disquiet in the Church is to go on, and if this General Convention is to give it a forward wave through the Church, what shall we have before the next General Convention? We shall have postal cards sent throughout the Church with regard to something else in the Prayer-Book. Do we believe that all disquietude will be quieted by the adoption of the plan that is set forth in this postal card? Has any man in this Church read Church history in such a way as to believe that there is ever to be peace throughout all the borders of the Church? You may dilute the Prayer Book in every possible and conceivable way, and yet there will be some point of difference of opinion. But suppose the Broad Church party goes on and becomes strong and decided in its theology, and then postal cards are sent out that "the brethren desire alterations in certain articles of religion, in the Office of the Holy Communion, and in other Offices of the Church, in the Office for the Burial of the Dead; many have come to disbelieve in the resurrection of the dead; many are disquieted; they have become so broad in their views," what are we to do? Thus, if we give countenance to this kind of thing, we shall give countenance to disquietude and distress in the Church. I am for leaving this service just as it is in the Prayer-Book.

Mr. COFFEE, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish to recite a few lines, and that is my only speech:

"Hark, in the lobby hear a lion roar;

Say, Mr. Speaker, shall we shut the door?

Or, Mr. Speaker, shall we let him in,

To see how quick we'll turn him out again?"

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am not going to make a speech; but I cannot stand here and see the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration put in danger without coming before

you again as an old Puritan. I was brought up as a Puritan, and my ancestors held the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; and as I told you before, in consequence of giving up Ritualism and of giving up Fonts they have lost the idea of any Divine grace in the sacraments of the Church, and the consequence of that is that baptisms have diminished so decidedly in their religion. They think nothing of the practice now. I want to attach every value to the grace given in the sacraments, and especially to the grace of Baptismal Regeneration. I do not like to hear such things said without getting up and bearing the testimony of my friend and pastor and Bishop, Bishop Eastburn. He was utterly opposed to any such change as is now proposed, and I feel that I am speaking for my old friend and pastor when I oppose any such change of the Prayer-Book. Where was he settled? He was settled in Boston; and I do not know whether this Convention have ever heard it, but they may appreciate it after it is stated, that it has been said that Boston was the place where the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was the most obnoxious, because if by the good providence of God a man had been born in Boston, to ask him to be born again was the greatest trial you could put him to. [Laughter.]

Our good brother from Virginia, has told us that this doctrine is an offence. Yes, sir, I know it is an offence, and so is all baptismal grace, but what does St. Paul say? That he gloried in preaching the "Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Mr. President—

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I move that the order appointed for twelve o'clock be postponed, and that this discussion go on.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I hope not.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. It seems to me very well worth while that a discussion so important as this should be prosecuted until we can reach its close, which will be perhaps within an hour or two, and in the meantime the other matter which comes after it in the order of nature can come after it in the order of fact. I move, therefore, that the order of the day for twelve o'clock be postponed.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. We have had a very able opening, and the question has been discussed in the Church for a hundred years. If men cannot talk their minds out it right off now, they cannot in a few hours hence.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. My objection to this motion I will state in a word. The order at twelve o'clock is the resolution which the Committee on Canons reported, proposing that a commission be appointed. Being satisfied that this measure will be killed, and wanting it killed, I think if this commission is appointed first, we can refer this that is now before us to that commission. Therefore, I hope that the debate fixed for twelve o'clock to-day will go on: I doubt whether it will take many minutes; and then if the commission is raised, it will be competent for some one to move to refer this matter to it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I hope we shall continue to discuss in English and not in Welsh. [Laughter.]

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I call for the order of the day.

The PRESIDENT. It wants a minute of the time, and I am a little uncertain whether that order supersedes this, because both subjects were appointed for special hours on the same day.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. One was appointed for eleven o'clock, and the other for twelve o'clock. I call for the order of the day for twelve

o'clock, and I think it will facilitate business to act on that and then refer the order for eleven o'clock to this Commission.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Can that motion be made when I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day is always in order when called for.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I rise to a point of order. Can one special order be superseded by another special order?

The PRESIDENT. That is the question.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I move that the preceding order be laid on the table.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I think there is a misunderstanding. [Order, order!]

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to lay the present order of the day on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Several Deputies. "Order of the day."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The order for the day for this House at twelve o'clock is the report of the Committee on Canons, No. 19. That which has been before the House is Report No. 18. The question was misunderstood. I myself voted to lay on the table, understanding thereby that Report No. 18 was laid on the table.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I suggest that we ought not to lay the order on the table, but to lay the subject under consideration on the table.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Allow me simply to state that every order of the day at the hour for which it is appointed takes precedence of all subsequently made orders of the day. I understand that the order of the day for eleven o'clock was made after the order of the day for twelve o'clock. If so, the House proceeding to consider its order for eleven o'clock when the order for twelve o'clock is called, nothing is done with the pending order, but the order for that hour comes up, as a matter of course. If it be disposed of in half an hour or ten minutes, then the antecedent order comes in its place again, so that no order or motion is necessary except to call for the order of the day for twelve o'clock, the other order standing in abeyance.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I hope the Chair will so rule.

The PRESIDENT. I do so rule. I submitted the parliamentary question to my friend from Virginia for his consideration, and I am satisfied he is right. Therefore the matter under consideration for the past hour is laid aside, and the House proceeds to the order fixed for twelve o'clock.

ARTICLE 4 OF CONSTITUTION.

A message (No. 59) from the House of Bishops announced that that House concurred in Message No. 50 from the House of Deputies, finally ratifying and agreeing to the alteration of Article IV. of the Constitution proposed in the last General Convention.

The PRESIDENT. This amendment to the Constitution is now adopted by the concurrence of both Houses.

RUBRICAL REVISION.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day fixed for twelve o'clock to-day is now before the House.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The present order of the day is in no respect in my charge from the Committee on Canons, but I merely rise to say, in confirmation of what has been said by one of my colleagues, that I believe that the quickest way to dispose of Report No. 18 will be with as much unanimity as possible, if the House is so disposed, to agree to the resolution in this Report, No. 19. In respect to No. 18, all that I would have to say has been ably said by my colleague from Pittsburgh, and I do think that the whole object to be attained in connection with these two reports will be accom-

plished by raising the commission desired and referring to that commission what has been previously under consideration.

The SECRETARY read the resolutions reported by the Committee on Canons, as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it is the sense of this Convention that nothing in the present Order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others. *Provided*, that, when used together, they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Commission, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven Laymen, be appointed (the Presbyters and Laymen to be chosen by ballot in the House of Deputies), to take into consideration the whole subject of Rubrical revision, among other things providing shortened and more varied services and a new Lectionary, and making such other suggestions as may seem judicious with respect to the services and offices of the Church, and to report to the next General Convention."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the first resolution.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois, obtained the floor.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I ask that these two resolutions, being entirely distinct, be considered separately. You give each one ten minutes to speak, and here are two resolutions, either of which might require a quarter of an hour. I hope the first resolution will be settled before we go to the second.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. The whole report is before us. There are grave questions, Mr. President and members of the Convention, arising under this proposed legislation. We have had in use in this country for the last eighty years a Prayer-Book substantially the same as the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. Our Prayer-Book, I contend, was not revised when adopted after the Revolution in this country, but we adopted the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. Certain light changes were made to conform to the civil changes, but in the main we adopted the same offices in the same language. The use of this Book has in the main worked well. It is true that absolute uniformity has not been secured, and I do not know that it is desirable to have absolute uniformity. The experience of the Church of England under this same Prayer-Book adopted there in 1661, and standing without revision for 209 years—mark it, standing without revision or change from 1661 to 1871—shows you how wonderfully well it has worked; and that great Church, from a very small body distracted and torn after the revolution under Cromwell, has grown to be a great body, with its 22,000 Presbyters and its 18,000 churches, chapels, and hospitals, and great works of charity all over England, and extending to all the colonies wherever the flag of England waves. We have followed that same precedent in this country, and for eighty years it has worked well.

Now, it is true a somewhat different view has grown up in England, as in this country, in different Dioceses. For instance, it is the positive order of the Church of England that the Athanasian Creed shall be read thirteen times in the year, in every Church in England, and still there are large numbers of chapels and churches in England where the Athanasian Creed has not been repeated within the memory of any living parishioner. In the days

of George the Third, in the worship at the Royal Chapel, that Creed was so offensive to the old King that when it was repeated he closed his book and bowed his head in silence, and it has ever been said that sometimes when that Creed was repeated the minister paused in the service, and the old King hobbled out on his gouty feet and started home. So there is a different use in the Church of England, and thirty years ago London was convulsed from end to end by an order from Bishop Bloomfield ordering and directing the reading on all occasions of public worship, on Sundays, etc., of the prayer for the Church militant. Notwithstanding its use was positively ordered in the service, its disuse had grown up, and when the order was made it almost created a riot.

In this country we have in our Prayer-Book an order for the daily service of this Church, and it is provided in our Prayer-Book that the whole of the Psalter shall be read through every month, and there is a positive provision for reading, on the 31st day of those months having thirty-one days, for reading the portion assigned to the 30th day. I think I know several churches in this country where the Psalter is not read through every month. We have a provision that in all cases of baptism on Sundays, it shall be after either Morning or Evening Prayer. I think there are large numbers of churches in which the baptisms do not always take place on Sundays after Morning or Evening Prayer. We have a provision in the Prayer-Book that the minister on Sundays shall give out the Holy Days and Fast Days that occur during the succeeding week. There are a great many churches, I understand, where this is not done, and where from ten o'clock on Sunday evening until the next Sunday morning at ten o'clock the church is never opened at all, instead of having daily prayers and the feasts and fasts of the Church kept as directed by the Prayer-Book as it now is. That direction is not followed at all.

Now what shall we do? Shall we hew to the line and enforce the present order, or shall we give more relaxation? What shall be done? We have certainly all the law we can enforce at the present time if we take up the Prayer-Book and begin with the first thing, the Order for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer. If we should commence there and undertake to enforce that I think we should have business enough on hand; and if we should go on and undertake to see that all the Rubrics were complied with in respect to Baptism, we should have business enough on hand; and if we should undertake to enforce the order that all the Holy Days and Fast Days should be given out on Sundays and kept, and the services conducted as prescribed, I think we should have a great deal of work on hand.

Now, it is proposed to give relaxation in the Rubrics in respect to the service for infant baptism. That service has stood in our Church, as it has stood in the Church of England since 1661, and I do not know how long before. It is proposed to relax that, but very differently from the relaxation which we have already provided as to the omission of the sign of the Cross. It is stated in the Rubrics that the sign of the Cross is only to be omitted at the request of the persons presenting the child for baptism, not the minister, but the recipient of the Sacrament is to make the request. Here in the proposition that we just had before us, it was proposed, not that the persons presenting the child, but that the minister should have the right of making the omission. I submit to this House that the parents and sponsors of the child are the proper parties to say whether the service shall be performed as prescribed in the Prayer-Book, and not the person who is to administer the Sacrament. Therefore the report, which was before taken up and which is

to be considered in connection with this, proceeds on an entirely wrong basis. It leaves it to the parents and sponsors of the child to say whether they want the full doctrines of the Church or only a part of them. The changed Rubric, as proposed, it is said, means the same thing—"No change in doctrine is hereby intended." Then I should like to know what it does mean? If no change in doctrine is intended by the change, what is the use of the change? But you may omit the exhortation and the declaration, one preceding and the other following the Lord's Prayer, and that thereby no change of doctrine is intended, and you may substitute the Collect for Easter Eve, which does not say anything at all about baptismal regeneration—omit two statements in the Prayer-Book which assert the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and substitute that which says nothing about it; and then we stultify ourselves by declaring that they mean the same thing! The whole proceeding is upon a wrong basis. It should be, if at all, at the request of the recipients of the office, the sponsors and parents of the child on the one hand, and on the other it is wrong for us to say that we can make an omission and insert something which is not the same, and say they are the same! That is something this Church cannot commit itself to. I doubt if there are a dozen clergymen in this House who are willing to vote that the Collect for Easter Eve means the same thing as the exhortation after the lesson in infant baptism, and that is what you vote for if you vote for the proposition last under consideration.

Now all I have to say is that I am attached to the old Prayer-Book. I like the old ways. I am opposed to novelties. I am satisfied with the Prayer-Book as it is. I do not believe we want changes. I am for a comprehensive church: I do not wish to narrow it. When you make a distinction that cuts in here and cuts in there, you drive the Church in one narrow channel and impair its usefulness. If for two hundred and nine years the Church of England has done the great work it has done, and our Church for eighty years has done the great work it has been and is doing with the Prayer-Book as it is, should we not let well enough alone? I am afraid of too much tinkering. I think we do not want it. Who cries out for these changes? If a commission get together, one will propose this thing, another that thing; and then, as was found in the Committee on Canons on the Ritual question, whatever is done is a compromise. One concedes one thing, and another another; and the very fundamentals of the faith are liable to be traded off in a committee or commission. "Stand by the old ways." My observation is that men like to hear the old prayers when they come into church.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention: There are some propositions contained in these resolutions for a commission in which I heartily concur; that is to say, I am in favor, as a distinct proposition, of allowing these shortened services; but I am utterly opposed—I concur, and I am glad to concur, with my friend from Illinois in utter opposition—to a roving commission to go and find wherein any tinkering can be done in this old Manual of our faith. I do not see any occasion for it. I have not heard anybody who has risen up here during this Convention and said he does not accord with the Prayer-Book as it stands. That is the sentiment of this House, as I believe he has properly uttered it.

Now, what is this commission to do but to bring in a parcel of projects which will consume the whole time of the next Convention in idle and unprofitable debate? It was the maxim of Lord Falk-

land—one of the most learned of all the laymen that ever were ornaments of this Church—that where there is no necessity for a change, there is a necessity not to change. Nobody urges a necessity for a change of anything that we have before us now. We are all satisfied; we take little difference of views on some points, but we all reconcile them with the text.

Can any human being frame human language in which men will agree? Every experienced lawyer knows that after a thousand years of adjudication you hardly reach a settled and firmly fixed adjudication of the text of a law; and that the more changes there are in the text the more litigation ensues, and that one of the processes which result from attempts at simplification of old things is that a new brood of suits spring up and there is an unsettlement of things by new language. That is the experience of every gentleman of the bar in this House. Now, when there is visibly too apparent amongst us a disposition, instead of going on to prosecute the great end of our organization, to fritter away our energies in contestation, we propose to light up the fires in all directions. It does seem to me one of the most ruinous propositions that this great Committee, this Committee which we all have so much confidence in, have developed in this Convention. I hope it will be voted down.

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. Mr. President, I should like, in connection with this question, to read a paragraph from the Preface to the Prayer-Book. Objection has been made by the learned Judge from Illinois (Mr. Otis) to the principle of compromise; and yet I think when we look into it for a moment we shall find that the Church herself recognizes and admits the advisability of that principle, and the application of it wherever the circumstances of the case seem to demand it.

“The same Church”—
The Church of England—

—“bath not only in her Preface, but likewise in her Articles and Homilies, declared the necessity and expediency of occasional alterations and amendments in her Forms of Public Worship”; and we find, accordingly, that, seeking to “keep the happy mean between too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting, variations in things once advisedly established, she hath, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, yielded to make such alterations in some particulars as in their respective times were thought convenient; yet so as that the main body and essential parts of the same (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still been continued firm and unshaken.”

I contend, in contradiction of what has been said on this floor, that the Church here recognizes in her very opening paragraphs the advisability of a principle of compromise, not being too stiff in refusing, and not, on the other hand, being too easy in admitting, variations, and that the application of this principle comes in wherever in the collective judgment of the Church the actual existing condition of the Church seems to demand the application of it.

It is said in connection with this subject that there is nothing in the existing condition of the Church to demand the application of this principle now. If this be so, I should like to enquire from this Convention, what means the whole deluge of memorials and petitions that have come to the Convention from, we are told, more than five hundred of the clergy of this Church, a fifth nearly of the whole, and a very large number of vestry and other laymen, together with the nearly unanimous action of one of the largest Dioceses? This seems to me a strong and

loud call from a large and respectable portion of the Church, demanding that, even if the changes asked for be not made, this Convention should be willing to do this much certainly—say it will entertain the question; it will entertain it so far as to grant the prayer proposed in this report of the Committee on Canons, namely, the appointment of a commission for examination into the subject. This Convention does nothing; it is a perfectly safe proposition to entertain. It is left for the judgment of the next Convention to pronounce whether the proposition shall be acted upon. And, in the meantime, I further contend that not only do these five hundred clergy speak out, but I venture to say that these five hundred clergy represent the honest and conscientious feeling of thousands upon thousands amongst the laity of the Church, and I wish to enter a plea before this Convention on behalf of those tens of thousands in the Church. Their consciences may be said to be weak; and it may seem to some here that it is a great crime that any persons should be found within the bounds of the Church who should have weak consciences. It may be their misfortune, but it is not their fault; and I think when we go back to the primitive legislation of the Christian Church, it will be found that the very existence of these weak consciences has been contemplated from the very foundation of the Church. The possibility of their existence is taken for granted, and the necessity of providing a remedy for these weak consciences insisted on.

The cry has been raised, not here, but elsewhere, with regard to persons who are troubled, for example, by the baptismal service; vague hints have been thrown out in regard to their seeking refuge elsewhere—“Let them go; they are not worth retaining.” Now, sir, that cry has not been raised, thank God, in this Convention. I do not believe there is one mouth in the Convention that would give utterance to it. It would, of course, be connected with such a movement as the Reformed Episcopal movement. Now, I wish to say—and I wish to say it in self-defence—that, for myself I regard that miserable movement with neither fear nor favor. It is perfectly true that when I go back to Scripture I can find Scripture warrant and authority for the movement. I can find it in the Old Testament. I find it in the Cave of Adullam, where every one that was in debt, and every one that was in distress, and every one that was discontented went to their chosen leader, and he became a captain over them. So I think I may say I find Scripture warrant. I find still older and more ancient Scripture warrant for that movement when I go back to the history of Israel. I find it in the history of Amalek, who we are told skulked like a coward in the rear of Israel and smote the hindermost of them, even all that were feeble behind them. These are the only Scriptural warrants that I find for the Reformed Episcopal movement.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I call the gentleman to order. He is personal in his remarks. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. I say that I regard that movement with neither fear nor favor. Therefore I do not bring that argument for one moment to bear on this Convention. I think it was Lord Macaulay who said that the reason on which the Puritans objected to bear-baiting was not so much that it gave pain to the bear as that it gave pleasure to the spectators. Now, I wish to say that my argument is founded not on consideration for the Reformed Episcopal movement at all, but simply on consideration for these weak consciences. There are thousands of these in the Church of Christ. The Apostle Paul in the first century provided for them. He legislated for himself and for

the Church at large, and said, "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died"; and I say that if this Church of the nineteenth century is prepared to walk in the footsteps of Paul, she will do some little thing to apply consolation, to give a sensation of rest and relief to these thousands who are disturbed. It may be a very small thing that is asked, but so much the more reason for granting it. Because they ask only a small thing, we are told that the granting of this small thing would be the entering in of the wedge; that, in other words, in the end it would split and break up the Church. Sir, years and years ago the small end of the wedge was inserted. There were persons then who objected to the use of the word "hell" in the Apostles' Creed.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. My point of order is this—that the matter under the consideration of this Convention just now—

The PRESIDENT. Let me speak about the point of order before you make it. The gentleman from Illinois has but a minute and a half, and it will take you longer to make your point of order than it will for him to finish. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Very well.

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. Certainly no harm can come from granting what is now asked.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention: In the politics of the Kingdom of Heaven there is room for statemanship; and I congratulate this Convention that it has before it for the first time a measure which bears on its face the lines of statemanship. Although I may not be believed, I speak as a conservative, a true conservative. Let me remind you of an incident with which most of you are familiar, in the recent Parliamentary history of our mother country. In 1868 a Tory Ministry came into power pledged to bring in a Reform Bill. "Look," said their opponents, "and see what a feeble child this new ministry will bring forth; we shall soon be back again." What did they do? They brought in a Reform Bill so much larger, so much more generous, so much more statesmanlike than that which had been introduced by the Radicals, that it made the reputation then and for ever of the statesman who is now Prime Minister of England.

A similar opportunity is given us to-day. I hold this measure to be the most important that has been before the American Church for fifty years. In it all the lines of debate upon which we have been engaged during this session are converged. They have all pointed to it. To it they all lead up. The gentleman on my left [Rev. Dr. Fulton, of Alabama] kindly cautioned me against speaking on Report No. 18 as I stepped on the platform. I had no such intention. And allow me to say, simply to disabuse the mind of any person who may have misunderstood me, that although the petition which has been referred to was drawn up and presented to me by a very dear friend, I constantly and steadfastly refused to sign it, on the ground that it was an unwise measure, partial, one-sided, narrow. I hope that this commission when appointed will be a large commission, representing all the great historic schools of the Church generously and fairly. I am sorry that it is not proposed to make it larger; but I am glad to observe that the language is "a commission," and not "a committee," so that we may be at liberty in voting to draw from all the wealth of learning in the Church, whether represented in this Convention or not.

Allow me to say that, just because I do believe we are in a crisis, I am opposed to anything like panic legislation, and I have felt dissatisfied with much of the legislation of this session, because it has seemed

to be just that panic legislation, and I hold that the boasted unanimity with which we passed our much-vaunted Canon the other day was in some sense—you will pardon me for saying it—a proof of its superficiality. I hold that the argument of the Ritualists, here and elsewhere, that canonical legislation upon this subject is unconstitutional, is an unanswerable argument. It has not been met or begun to be met by any speaker on this floor.

Now, sir, because we are in a crisis, I say it is time that we should be cool-headed and clear-headed. What is the crisis? The gentleman who preceded me spoke as if he imagined it to be a crisis brought on by a recent movement in this Church known as the Reformed Episcopal movement.

Rev. Dr. SULLIVAN, of Illinois. I repudiate that.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. The gentleman repudiates that. I am glad he does. To my mind, the crisis comes of a far profounder movement than that. It comes of a movement born by Divine Providence forty years ago in the marvellous brain of that illustrious man, John Henry Newman. It is in the culmination of the movement begun by him that we stand to legislate to-day; and no man who feels the indebtedness that most theological students must feel to the great mind of that movement will wish, in any such measure as this, its results should be kept out of view. We are sitting, and have been sitting, in this Convention, in judgment upon that great movement; for, as I said before, and as I honestly believe, in the Providence of God it is a movement which, while some of its friends have acknowledged sadly to have been a partial failure, is a movement full of rich results, which we are now prepared to garner.

I agree with the distinguished Lay Deputy from Maryland (Mr. Blair) in deprecating the making of our Triennial Conventions the scenes of perpetual controversy; and it is because I believe that until this measure is carried perpetual controversy must continue, that I am in favor of its passage. A former Presbyterian of this Church and a distinguished ornament of its ministry, now a member of the Roman Catholic order of Paulists, said in his book with infinite humor that he had at last reached a church where there was no longer any apprehension of the doings of the next General Convention. Sir, there will be ground for that apprehension until we meet the issue which is before us fairly and squarely.

There is in these matters a periodic law largely independent of individual thought and feeling; and if you will look over the history of the Church you will find that from time to time, by the workings of this periodic law, there comes a call for the readjustment of the formularies of worship, prayer and praise—not formularies of faith, remember, but the formularies of worship, the rules of discipline—to the present existing state of things. And what man looks back upon the past history of this country during one hundred years but will admit that there never was a century more calculated to create such an exigency as we now see, than this century that has passed in this land?

Now I come to the objections. They are two. The first is, and it will be repeatedly urged on this floor, that it is unwise to take so important a step as this under excitement. I agree; but I ask you to consider seriously and candidly whether such a measure is ever likely to reach a point where anybody will act on it, unless there is a certain amount of excitement. Excitement is not always unhealthy; a certain amount of it may be healthy; and believe me that, in a time of deadness and indifference, a

wise measure like this never could have been launched.

Now, the second objection—and I speak of this with diffidence, remembering where I am. It has been urged with a questionable rhetorical taste by a voice from without—and, did I not remember where I am, I should use stronger language than to say “questionable rhetorical taste”—that this body, from its very nature, is as incompetent to deal with matters of Liturgical Revision as the Common Council of this city is to deal with the music of Beethoven. Sir, I venture to traverse that proposition utterly; and I venture to say that if the history of the last forty years in this Church means anything, it means this: That the mind of the Anglican Communion in England and in this country has been gradually undergoing a process of education looking toward this very end. There never was a time since the Reformation—and I make this assertion asking for correction from any one competent to correct me—when there was so much liturgical knowledge in this Church as now. Contemporaneously with the movement to which I have referred, the Tractarian movement, so called, was begun in England, a parallel movement of a different character, namely, a movement for the revival of Biblical scholarship; and what has been the result? The result has been a similar event in the Biblical line to what we now have presented to us in the liturgical line, namely, a movement for a revision of the Holy Scriptures. [Here the hammer fell.]

Several DEPUTIES. Go on; go on.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I ask no favor. I have indicated my line of thought.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I had not intended to participate in this discussion, and you will excuse me if I say that I do not now intend to participate in it. A remark made, however, by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Blair) rendered it desirable, as I think, for me to state a fact to this Convention, which is the purpose of my taking the stand.

When speaking upon this subject, he alluded to the universal, or well-nigh universal, feeling of the necessity of providing in some form for a shorter form of services. I desire to say, in reference to that matter, that the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, of which I have the honor to be a member, have had that matter before them, and, if I am not mistaken, there is a report upon our Calendar to be acted upon touching that question of a shorter service. The gentleman from Maryland seemed to imply in what he said that providing for that necessity was a matter which was, to some extent, involved in this question of a revision. I desire to say no; the Constitution itself provides that the Prayer-Book may be touched by a certain class of action, and amendments to the Constitution may be made by a certain character of action, both much alike, but nevertheless they are independent subjects. The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution are of the opinion that this matter of a shortened service may be provided for better than by touching the Prayer-Book, and they have so reported. It is that it may be provided for by a very simple amendment to the Constitution, and they have made a report to that effect. If gentlemen who have the Constitution before them will turn to Article 8, they will find that it reads thus:

“A Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, Articles of Religion, and a Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those Dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution. No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book

of Common Prayer, or other Offices of the Church, or the Articles of Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention.”

The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution have prepared a proposed amendment to follow immediately after this Article of the Constitution as it now stands. In substance it is—I do not know that I can give the exact words: “Provided, That the General Convention may provide for a shorter form of service, compiled exclusively from the daily Morning and Evening Prayer.” That reaches it by a simple amendment to the Constitution, without touching the Prayer-Book, and the necessity which the Deputy from Maryland alluded to is provided for without at all involving this question of a commission upon the Prayer-Book.

And now, having said this, which was really what I obtained the floor to say, allow me to add, as I am on the floor, that I believe I know something, not fully perhaps, not so fully as I should, but yet I believe I have a very general idea, and I think a correct idea, of the feeling, wish, and heart of the laity of the Church throughout the country; and I believe that feeling and that wish is to “let the Prayer-Book alone.” Whatever theologians may say, or however they may differ, I humbly submit that the voice of the laity of this Church is, to use a slang phrase, but a significant one, “hands off”; that Prayer-Book is too sacred to be touched in a period of excitement. I, for one, do not recognize the idea or its wisdom that because I have a particle of dust in my eye, therefore I shall put an oculist at work with his knife.

Rev. Mr. GARRISON, of New Jersey. I regard this, Mr. President, as evidently one of the most statesmanlike movements in our Church. I approach it from no partisan view. I have no desire for High Church legislation or for Low Church legislation; but I conceive that the Church in our country, the Church in our age, has problems submitted to it which have never before been in the power of the Church since the conversion of Constantine. For the first time, we stand in the history of the Church able to compass the great problem of self-development—of self-development under conditions which allow—nay, when the highest obligations to God and man constrain us to meet the wants of a world. We have given to us not merely the Anglo-Saxon race, with their love of order, of propriety, of stability, but we have given to us the problem of the Indian race, with their peculiar characteristics, to train and cultivate; we have the problem of the negro race, with their enthusiasm, their need to be governed through certain of the more æsthetic parts of public worship. We have the Chinese race coming, and we have to meet them. We have, beside all this, the fact that we are in an age of the world when every element of thought is in ferment, when men need the stability of settled teaching and yet the flexibility of ready adaptation. In the means. We need the power to adopt all that is elegant, all that is beautiful, in the worship of the Church in its age of grandeur, in the time when glory and beauty were used to adorn the house of Almighty God. We need, as has been well said, to go to the very threshold of mediæval error, provided we mark upon the door, “That is mediæval error.” We need to go to the very barrier of the nineteenth-century sectarianism if we draw the line and mark deep the abyss: “That is sectarianism.” And to do that we need to have our Church ritual revised, not the words, not the service, not the doctrines—they have come down

to us as the unchangeable deposit of the faith—but we need to have the power of adaptation; we need to say that things which are now uncertain in the minds of conscientious men may or may not be done.

I recorded myself, for example, upon the subject of Ritual as in favor of proper restrictions; and yet no man stands upon this floor who would be more willing to mark the utmost safe limit to Ritual as the science of devotion, the science of reverence, the science of symbolizing everything that is grand and true and beautiful and powerful in the Church of God. I only want to draw the line where it passes from Catholic truth to Romish heresy. To do that, and let wise minds and free minds do it with conscientious certainty, requires that we settle vexed points of law. No man can say to-day certainly what is the law of the American Church in regard to the Ritual and the ornament of the Church. I read this morning of Sir Archibald Stephens, high authority, that the law on every such subject is unsettled and uncertain even in England, where they have had ages of experience in interpreting the law. If the law is so unsettled, how are we to settle it? I find my brethren who go toward the extreme of high observance are conscientious, many of them, indeed, think they can do under the law that which I, with equal conscientiousness; think the law does not allow them to do. We want not a tinkering commission, but to let us know somewhere where the line can be drawn, that we may know what the law is upon the right hand and upon the left. I desire a broad law, but I desire a law.

I can say, with scarcely the possibility of a doubt, that every clergyman has violated the Canons and Rubrics in holding services without employing the whole of the Morning Prayer. To stand up in a congregation of utterly ignorant, untaught, illiterate men, as I have done, and as you have all done, time and again, and begin to read a responsive service, to make them say after you paragraph after paragraph, or have no echo, is simply an absurdity in many cases; and in the name of common sense I have violated, and I presume we have all violated, the direct literal observance of the Rubrics, because we cannot observe them. Make the variations to come within reasonable limits, and then we shall have a law under which we can live, and not encourage a disrespect for law.

I think that this Church has one grave duty which has not been touched in any debate here, and that is the duty of instructing and continuing to instruct this American people in the idea of obedience to law. We have had it as our high boasts that we as a Church did hold that; but under the pressure of strong feeling and intense impulse we have allowed variations here, variations there, and we are in great danger of losing our very reputation as a law-observing community, when we teach this great nation that license may be allowable in a Church boasting itself pre-eminently as the Church of law. Let us go, therefore, to this matter of Rubrical observance, that we are not to make laws for the Reformed Church or those who desire to go off in that direction, nor for the so-called Ritualists and those who go off there; but with a broad, true, catholic desire to give the widest liberty, but liberty within law. Then, sir, having done that, we shall know where the Church stands, and what the Church is.

Nor can it be a matter of haste. It must take at least three years of calm enquiry. It may take three years more. We can postpone it from term to term until we feel able to crystallize these things; for do not let us say at the very barrier that we will do nothing in this great age, when men are enquiring how we are to bring back all that is possible

of the great old Catholic world of the early ages. The more I look into it, the more I reverence it. The more I think over those great masters, the more I feel that there were giants in those days. The more I worship with these old Liturgies in my hand, the more do I feel raised to God. The most precious book on my table, outside the Holy Bible, is a book of ancient Liturgies. The Church owes Mason Neale a debt it never can repay, in bringing to the heart and home and table of every clergyman in this land those grand and glorious exhalations from the souls of men who lived near God; and as we have the problem of bringing back their spirit to the Church and to this age, let us not say because we inherited a glorious Liturgy from insular England at the verge of a great contest, when minds were necessarily narrowed, though broad, marvellously, almost miraculously broad under their circumstances, they yet were in a condition of things not able to see the futurity that has opened out on this New World. Let us not say that we will stand there, and in a spirit of superstitious regard for the iota of the text, say we will not let the Church broaden and deepen and expand itself until it shall cover the whole land, as the ocean covered the mighty deep. I hope that the Church will feel the need of letting us imbibe the old spirit, of letting us understand, of letting us see what may be needed, and take three years—take six years—take half a century, if it need be, to do it; let us not say that we propose to stand where we did three hundred years ago, when the world has moved as certainly as it did in the time of Galileo.

Mr. McCRA DY, of South Carolina. Mr. President and gentlemen—I only rise to warn you of what you are about to do. If you determine that you have come to such a crisis that a most extraordinary measure must be adopted, so be it; but it is against the spirit of your Constitution, against the spirit of the compact which was made by all of us in affirming the Constitution and adopting the Prayer-Book, and it is attended with dangers which any man can see, and some of which have been pointed out.

The Prayer-Book can be amended. I am not a worshipper of the Prayer-Book any more than I am a worshipper of the outside of the Bible; but I say this: That when that body which adopted our Constitution determined distinctly that there was a way to amend the Prayer-Book, they marked out that as the proper way and no other; and if you adopt any other way, it will be something like a revolution. You call a commission which is virtually the same almost as calling a civil convention. You get there the elements of those who desire change, and perhaps the elements of those who do not desire change, and what is the result? Do you know how many do desire change? I desire change. I desire change in the rubrics, and a change in the rubrics is all that I want; and we change the text by changing the rubrics. Is there a man here who cannot perceive that if you give unlimited control over the Rubrics, if you give men the right to take the Rubrics and alter them, and adapt them to their own notions, you in fact subject the text to change. Take the Office for the Consecration of Bishops. You have these two forms. One Rubric says, "Omit that." Now, when you come to this about regeneration, if you omit the Rubric you are altering the text. I would ask you to omit something too. I would ask you to omit the "proceeding from the Father and the Son," and I would only ask it by Rubric. I would put it in parentheses, and I would say that he who performed the service might omit it. Then perhaps there is another word there I would like to omit, and that is, "Trinity," and I would substitute "Jehovah,"

that name by which He called himself when He gave the Ten Commandments. Are you willing that these changes should be made? Give me the power to cast the Rubrics and I would do that. Now, you can see at once that when you commit the whole of the Rubrics to a commission you commit the whole of the Prayer-Book to a commission, and I say it is a most dangerous experiment.

But the Prayer-Book points out directly how you shall amend it. How shall it be? Specifically name your difficulty, set forth your difficulty, make your change, submit it to the whole Church, and then, if you adopt it, then it is all right; but if you go to a commission, you cannot resist it. I want to get the changes I have indicated. I would consent to some other change if I could get it, so that no mischief would be done. I would not go for that which people may call vulgarly "log-rolling"; but a conscientious man may do it, and he may believe that he will be serving God by doing it.

Now, gentlemen, I only wish to put the matter before you that you may understand what you are going to do. If you wish to have something like a revolution, then appoint your commission, because that will be the beginning of that revolution. If you choose to amend the Prayer-Book as those who composed it and fixed it have determined, take every objection to it *seriatim*, and consider it by itself. Do not let other considerations enter into it, but just consider that one thing and no more; and if you agree that that alteration shall be made, let it be made. As I have said, I am willing to change the Prayer-Book. I think that those who say nothing is to be changed in it, make a great mistake. Those who made it intended it to be changed, because they pointed out how it should be changed. All I ask you to do is to stand under that, and change it just as it was intended to be changed, and all will be content; but do not attempt that which I tell you cannot be anything else but the beginning of a revolution, and it is a very hazardous thing to adventure on such a step.

The proposition originally came in the shape of a congress, in which the House of Bishops was to be a part and as many of this House as we chose to put, so that we might have a hundred or two hundred. Now, I resist all attempts against the Prayer-Book by commission. I am willing that there shall be attached to it any member that you please. That will be growth, but if you start to remodel and reform the whole, it is not growth but revolution, radical change; you go to the root of the matter.

All that I wanted to do was to point out that. I say take care how you amend the Prayer-Book by amending the Constitution. The two things are very different. Why was it said that you shall amend the Constitution in one way, and then that a separate article was put in to show how you are to amend the Prayer-Book? There was wisdom in this. If you want to amend the Constitution so as to get to the Prayer-Book, you partly blind the eyes of those to whom you are addressing yourself. Take the instance which my friend from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution set before you, to amend it so as to allow this General Convention to order new services. I say if you do that you break down the ramparts which protect the Prayer-Book, and soon you may do what you please with it. The design to amend was this: if you want to amend the Prayer-Book go directly to the change in the Prayer-Book, and do not change your Constitution, and give somebody else the power to change the Prayer-Book. Go directly to the thing in the Prayer-Book which you want to change, and let all your Dioceses know what you are going

to do. Do not conceal it. I do not mean that my friends intend to conceal at all, but do not allow it to be concealed or veiled in any way by a proposition to amend the Constitution.

I think you can do nothing more hazardous than to amend the Prayer-Book through the Constitution with a view of getting a commission, which is to accommodate everybody with new Rubrics. I have said all I have to say, and I trust that gentlemen will not think it a mere habit of resistance to change on my part, for I have none of that. I desire changes, and one of these, if I could have got the ear of this body, I would have proposed here, and put it to you whether you would adopt it. And let every man who wants to change the Prayer-Book put his change to the House. The proposition for a change in the Baptismal Service goes directly to the point: and I would say what has been said by the gentleman from Illinois is true, you have only considered one side, just as also this proposition about dividing the services. You have only considered one side. One is to do it. The one gives it to the minister only. It does not consult the other people at all. Now, I consider that the congregation, the sponsors, the parents, all have rights to that service just as much as the Presbyter who is to pronounce the words, and therefore I would make such a provision; and those gentlemen who want it carried out had better make that provision so that it will guard every man's right; and when they have guarded every man's right and all agree, well, I do not know that they save the doctrine, for when they say it does not change the doctrine it is a tacit admission that there is a doctrine there, and if you take that assent and do it, after that they never can deny it is there. Therefore I do not so much object to it, but I think it is quite possible it will have the same result as when they bracketed "hell." [Laughter.] When I was a boy I never heard it, and now I go nowhere that I do not hear "He descended into hell"; and that very same thing I believe will be the end of this thing. If you remove it from contestation, as was said, I believe you will very soon find that everybody will say "regenerate."

Rev. Mr. WARD, of Maine. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I am not a lawyer, but I have sat in my seat in this House, and listened to the wisdom of lawyers with profound consideration. But, sir, I would rather listen on this subject to the wisdom of the Gospel than to the wisdom of those lawyers in this House, and I have learned that the Church of Christ is the extension of the incarnation in this world for the salvation of immortal souls, and I am a clergyman in this Church in order to do this work in my humble way of extending the Church of Christ in this country.

Now, sir, what do we propose to do by this commission for Rubrical revision? We propose to adapt the Prayer-Book of our Church to the needs of the Church in this country, in order to gather in the multitudes of this country who are creedless and almost Christless, and we feel that we have a mission among them. What did we do the other day in enacting the Canon on Ritual but provide for the adaptation of this Church to the needs of the country? Now I hold that we need to furnish this Commission on Rubrical revision, in order to adapt our Prayer-Book, in its Rubrics, in its adaptation of services, to the needs of every parochial and every missionary clergyman in this Church. I doubt whether there are many parochial clergymen in our Communion who are not compelled to break the Rubrics, and I have yet to learn that any of our missionary clergymen can live one week in their

several cures or positions without breaking Rubrics. I want to be a law-abiding clergyman, and in order to be a law-abiding clergyman we must have our Prayer-Book so adapted that we can conscientiously discharge our duty as parish priests and as missionary clergymen in the doing of our appropriate work.

For this reason I feel that this is of the very highest importance. In fact I do not know that any subject of greater importance has come before this House than forming a committee on this subject of Rubrical revision. Take the daily services. It is said that the daily services are not attended because they are too long. They need to be adapted to our rapid, active American life. Take the missionary services in new places, and we have to adapt them to the needs of our work. Take the weekly services, and take all the daily round of activity which every parish clergyman is familiar with, and if we can have something done to meet the wants of our communion in regard to shorter services, in regard to greater variety of regular forms of public service, and in regard to a new Lectionary, it seems to me it would be a great relief to many earnest men who are trying to do the Church's work in their several places and appointments. I am aware there are difficulties connected with this commission, but there are difficulties connected with everything under the sun, and there will be to the end of time.

Let me speak upon one other point and I have done. What is the English Church doing? We are pointed to her as the mother of all wisdom for the Anglican Communion, and she is about appointing through her House of Convocation a committee on this very subject of adapting the English Church to meet the wants of the English nation. Let us in our wisdom follow the example of our mother Church, and do something in our way to adapt our Prayer-Book, good and noble as it is, the inherited wisdom of all Christian ages, to the needs and wants of the American people; and do it, not in a panic, but in sober wisdom and real earnest.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, obtained the floor.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. Will Dr. Watson allow me a moment to offer a resolution?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Certainly.

Rev. Dr. NORTON, of Virginia. I am sure many of us are anxious to reach a vote on this important subject; and, reluctant as I am to interfere with a discussion so interesting and instructive, I would like to move, and if the gentleman from North Carolina will permit me, I will now move, that in ten minutes, allowing him to make his speech if he wishes, we vote upon the question now before the House.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I object, Mr. President; I think that would hardly be fair. I believe that this measure will pass through the Convention, and I trust that it may. It may be that, on behalf of the Committee, there may be something yet to be said; and, at all events, if this measure goes through the Convention, its power, to force, its value will depend upon moral unanimity, which can only be attained by the freest discussion of all men.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to take the vote in ten minutes.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from North Carolina allow me to send to the Chair an amendment which I wish to offer to the second resolution when it comes up, simply to give

it more efficiency, for I am in favor of the resolution?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Certainly.

The SECRETARY. In the second line of resolution second the proposed amendment is to strike out the word "Commission," and insert the word "Committee," and in the fifth line after the word "Deputies," to insert "Whose duties it shall be, at as early a day as practicable, to appoint a commission, to be constituted as they may think best," so that it will read:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Committee, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven laymen, be appointed, the Presbyters and laymen to be chosen by ballot in the House of Deputies, whose duty it shall be, at as early a day as practicable, to appoint a Commission, to be constituted as they may think best, to take into consideration the whole subject of Rubrical revision," etc.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I was out at the opening of the debate this morning, and am not sure that I have heard everything which has been said. It is possible, therefore, I may repeat some things that have been better said than I can say them. Still, as a member of the Committee on Canons, and particularly as connected with the Subcommittee to which this measure was referred, it seems to me but appropriate that I should give the reasons for casting my own vote in its favor. I desire at all events that it should be to the edification of the House, and if I fail it will not be for want of a good intent.

In the first place, let it be said or repeated, and understood carefully, as has been said already, that there is no change of faith proposed but only a change of services. We do not propose therefore to disturb in anywise the foundation of the faith, and we only propose a variety of services, such as shall be entirely consistent with those foundations and built up squarely upon them and nothing more, for no man would be more unwilling to depart from the sacred principles which underlie the Constitution of the Church and our Prayer-Book than I. But I apprehend it is no such fundamental or revolutionary measure; nor, in the next place, do we intend to take a revolutionary mode of effecting the change. To all statesmen and politicians certainly this thing is well known. It is not strange that Constitutions of States may be changed. That is not a revolution. Committees or Commissions, just as you please to call them, may be appointed to change the Constitution, and there is no revolution in that, provided it be done in a lawful and deliberate way; and that is all which this Committee proposes to do. It proposes to put it in the power of a Commission not to make changes, as seems to have been thought by some who have opposed the matter on this floor, but to suggest them, and it is utterly impossible, as the case now stands, that anything can be confirmed in this direction within the space of six years. All that that Commission can do will be to suggest changes to the next General Convention, and the next General Convention entirely out of its own power or in its own power, and what the commission will have done will be simply preparatory, suggestive and informal. It will not bind the Convention in one particle. The Convention will be perfectly free to act, and of its own motion to suggest to the succeeding General Convention that which it proposes to do. There is no resolution, therefore, in the matter. All must concur in this order, the Bishops, clergy and laity, or the order cannot pass, and they must concur not only once, but twice.

Sir, I have long had a desire to see some such changes as these, and the desire has entered my

mind from practical directions. I have felt the difficulties of our position with respect to the Rubrics in carrying out the services of the Church as a minister. I have, however, feared that it was impracticable. In the first place, I have been exceedingly reluctant to disturb the Prayer-Book at all. I have felt that it was dangerous to open the door, lest things should come in which would prove disastrous to us. If blessings come in, it may be that some things which are curses may enter with them. I acknowledge that danger. It must be for the wisdom of this Convention to guard against it. But at the same time, with all my fears, upon conversing with many Churchmen lately, my hopes also have been raised. I have come to hope that at last something of this kind may be done; and now let me give briefly some reasons why I think it should be done. I will endeavor to be brief. I say there are certain great advantages in prospect in this change. It must be confessed that the difficulties we feel are real. We do not pretend that the Church is absolutely perfect, that the Common Prayer Book is perfect, or that the Rubrics are perfect. We cannot say that. We believe that they are near perfection, but they are not absolutely so. Why should we not have them still nearer if the wisdom of the Church can detect any road to that result?

Now, I say that the Rubrics, toward the arrangement of which the adoption of this measure is directed, are some of them doubtful, some of them difficult of execution, and some of them defective. There are doubtful Rubrics, as for instance the position of priests receiving the Communion. I have no doubt about that myself, but there are those who doubt whether that Rubric prescribes that he shall kneel himself or receive it standing. I will not take up time by reading the Rubric; you will find it in the Prayer-Book. Then there is doubt as to whether individual congregations or whole dioceses can consent to the omission of the phrase, "He descended into hell," to which reference has been made. Again, it is doubtful whether certain Anthems are allowable in parts of the service which have not been provided by Rubrics. I mention these rapidly; I cannot dwell upon them, for my time is short.

Again, there are difficult Rubrics; for instance, that Rubric which requires a certain number to be present at the communion of the sick. The ministers of the Church know full well how sometimes they may be disappointed at the last moment, having made every arrangement that is required; the persons may be absent; and shall the dying man go without the Last Supper which he desires? If for no other reason, because he desires it, because it is necessary in order to quiet his own mind and comfort him at that last extreme moment—I say shall he go without it because the Rubric says two persons shall be present, and the minister having provided for them to be present, they have absented themselves? Again, I have had an instance in my own knowledge, in my own congregation, where persons receiving the communion on their dying beds have died before it was administered. The services preceding the act are too long. Again, there is a Rubric, as you all know, which provides that at the end of the Communion Service, the elements remaining shall be consumed by the minister and other communicants, and not be carried out of the Church. I have known so much wine left us as to endanger those who have received, and put them in danger of taking too much, by endeavoring to follow the Rubric as it stands. Of course, they cannot generally consume so much as to overthrow their reason; but we must

make some disposition consistent with the great law of temperance. Then, again, there are difficulties which arise at funerals—the burying of persons who have not received the baptism of the Church. But I will not dwell on that; that is a minor matter.

But there are defective Rubrics also. I think our Rubrics should provide more largely a Lectionary to suit all seasons of the Church, more accurately for postures in the Baptismal Office, and we should not be obliged to have recourse to our Bishops for direction in this matter. And so in the Confirmation service; and in prescribing rules for clergymen, you know what a wide field is opened for dispute, and sometimes for angry dispute, and our Rubrics prescribe absolutely nothing. So, too, with the ornaments of the Church; and so in providing for shortened services, we desire Rubrics which shall be more complete.

I maintain that the letter of those Rubrics is imperative. If circumstances make it possible—I do not say easy—I feel bound to comply with the letter of the Rubrics. All do not agree with me in that matter. There are many excuses offered, and I have heard it said on this floor that there is no clergyman in this Church who does not break these Rubrics. I strive not to break one. There are those who say the Rubric of common-sense will come in and settle these matters. I protest against that; and to get that out of the way is one of my motions for advocating this measure. I say it is a dangerous Rubric. It puts into the mind or judgment or fancy of every individual man, Presbyter or Deacon, what he shall do in common-sense to justify him in departing from the letter of the Church's law which has been put upon him. He has sworn to obey that law, and I say he is bound to obey it in the face of everything which is not absolutely impossible. Impossibility, of course, knows no law. I know these are loyal men who do these things; men who mean to obey the Church; but I say their consciences are strained, and we can relieve that strain, and we ought to do it. We should not keep such a strain upon the minds of our brethren.

There are also advantages of manner, I maintain, in the action proposed. We propose to make a constitutional measure. There are constitutional difficulties. The Constitution provides how the Prayer-Book shall be changed. We propose to take this out of all minor spheres and put it where the Constitution leaves it. The Constitution, by providing for this contingency, did anticipate such a movement as we propose now. It is not unconstitutional; it is not contrary to the spirit of the Church. The contingency was provided for by the Church itself. I am as much as anybody opposed to anything like haste or inconsideration in this matter lest wrong things be done, wrong Rubrics be made, lest we do things inconsistent. And here is an answer to some of the positions taken by the Deputy from South Carolina. I object to specific or special legislation in this matter just because it may make your legislation inconsistent. Let it be a general measure, and your Rubrics will all hang together and be one harmonious whole, such as the Church of God should present. The proposition, let us remember, is not to do this thing hastily, but to do it at the end of six years at the nearest, at the end perhaps of nine years. I hope the measure will pass.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT. The hour for recess is near at hand.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. There is a message from the House of Bishops necessary to be concurred in, which I ask to bring before the House.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I give way for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT. It is necessary to concur in that, and then I have a letter to read to the House which I think they will all stay to hear.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN CHURCHES.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Yesterday, Message No. 54 was received from the House of Bishops, informing this House of the appointment of members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Churches. I move that this House confirm their action.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOSING SERVICES—HOLY TRINITY CHURCH.

The PRESIDENT. I desire to read the following letter to the House, not for immediate action, but that it may be the subject of consideration for action which is not far off.

CHURCH OF THE HOLY TRINITY, Madison Avenue and Forty-second St.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: I am instructed by the corporation of the Church of the Holy Trinity to offer to the General Convention the use of their new church for the closing services of the present session.

To this official announcement permit me to add my personal hope that the Convention may find it convenient to accept the invitation. A large number of the clergy and laity of the city are desirous to unite in the solemnities which will conclude the work of the Convention for whose comfort we are satisfied that we can offer superior facilities. The chancel of the Church will accommodate the whole House of Bishops, and ample provision can be made for the House of Deputies without excluding a single worshipper from without.

With considerations of personal regard,

I am faithfully yours,

STEPHEN H. TYNG, JR.

Rev. JAMES CRAIK, D.D.,

Pres't. House of Deputies.

I wish to say, gentlemen, that many of us must recollect with pain the close of the last General Convention in Baltimore nearly at midnight. It was the loss of an opportunity, valuable and important, to present this Church in its best aspect to the people of that city and to the strangers who were assembled there. I hoped then, I hope now, that we shall not have a repetition of that scene, but that the closing services of the Convention, as the opening services, will be of a proper and reverential character, and I am specially pleased with the invitation which I have just read.

There is another matter connected with the Church of the Holy Trinity, which it is my duty to bring before the House. When objection was made on the first day of our session to this building as one incapable of accommodating the House in its business, and we adjourned with the expectation that possibly we should be compelled to remove, the authorities of that church heard of the difficulty and had a meeting, and offered to this Convention, through the President, the use of that most beautiful church—the best church for speaking in I ever saw—and were willing to make all the sacrifices that were necessary to accommodate it to our use; and I received through a third party a letter making that proffer. But while this matter was in negotiation, the House had settled down to satisfaction with the present building, the Committee to whom the subject belonged having made so many admirable improvements for our accommodation. Therefore I only showed the letter to many mem-

bers of the House. I now give its substance to the whole House, that we may consider it in connection with this request. I hope that this invitation will be accepted, and, if not, that, at all events, the hearty thanks of the House will be rendered to these gentlemen for their kindly and generous offer, showing that we are, in heart, in affection, in so many most important respects, one.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. I move that we accept the invitation, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Allow me to say, also, that the proposition was made to the delegation from New York, to have the use of that church for the holding of this Convention, but it was not received until after the delegation had had their meeting, and had made all the arrangements for accepting the use of this church, and had adjourned, and it was too late to revise their decision.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Before we accept this invitation, I think a little consideration will be necessary; and without wishing to be appointed on the Committee, I think it would be much better that a Committee should be appointed to act jointly with a Committee of the House of Bishops, to take into consideration what building shall be used for the closing services. Then this invitation can be laid before that Committee, and they can consider all the points relating to the matter.

The PRESIDENT. If you desire to refer it to any committee, we have already a Committee on the Closing Services of the Convention, to which it ought to be referred.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. Very well. I move, then, that it be referred to that Committee.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that this invitation be referred to the Committee on the Closing Services of the Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

The hour for the recess having arrived, the House took a recess till 2 o'clock P.M., at which time the President resumed the chair.

LECTIONARY FOR LENT, ETC.

A message (No. 60) from the House of Bishops, announced the adoption by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Table of Lessons, reported by the Joint Committee on the Table of Lessons for week days in Lent, be authorized for use until the next General Convention; provided, the same shall be approved by the Bishop of each diocese or missionary district respectively.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee be continued in charge of this matter for its more thorough consideration, and to afford opportunity for such improvements as may be suggested by its actual use.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Table of Lessons for the Ember and Rogation Days presented herewith be authorized for use on the same conditions as the Table of Lessons for Lent."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that we concur in those resolutions.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. It will be observed that those are precisely the resolutions which were considered in this House yesterday.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution have a report to offer on that matter.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Then I offer the following as a substitute:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Lectionary for week days in Lent, reported by the Joint Committee on that subject, together with that for the Rogation and Ember Days, pre-

sented by the same Committee, is hereby proposed as an addition in the Prayer-Book, and that it be made known by the Secretary of this body to the Convention of every Diocese of this Church, in accordance with the provision of Article VIII. of the Constitution, as matter for final action at the next General Convention."

The PRESIDENT. Is that to go on the Calendar as a proposed amendment to the resolutions in the message of the House of Bishops?

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. If this matter is committed to the commission on the revision of the Rubrics, as is proposed by some, it will take six years before we are able to derive any sort of benefit from it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Will the House allow me one word? There is a report in regard to Article VIII. that is to be brought up here, in which the Committee have proposed to the Convention such a revision of Article VIII. as will allow these objects to be gained by a Canon, and it seems to me unwise to decide to put through another process until that matter has been discussed and settled.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Is that on the Calendar?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCRAIDY, of South Carolina. Let me say that that does not cover it at all. I hope the gentleman from New York will have his Lectionary adopted independent of anything else.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I think so. Then this is the resolution which I offer as a substitute for the resolutions which have come down from the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. It will go on the Calendar.

NEW DIOCESE IN WISCONSIN.

A message (No. 61) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had concurred in Message No. 40 from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, giving the consent of the General Convention to the erection of a new Diocese within the limits of the present Diocese of Wisconsin.

PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I move that the report of the Special Committee in relation to the Senior and Presiding Bishop, be taken from the Calendar and referred to the Committee on Expenses, striking out the word "instructed" and inserting the word "requested" in the resolution relative to that Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The PRESIDENT. The order of the day for two o'clock is the action on the nomination of Missionary Bishops, on which the House sits with closed doors. Persons not members of the Convention will please retire from the Church.

The church having been cleared, the House proceeded to consider with closed doors the nominations of Missionary Bishops sent down by the House of Bishops. The result was the election of Rev. Alexander C. Garrett, D.D., as Missionary Bishop of Northern Texas, Rev. Robert W. B. Elliott as Missionary Bishop of Western Texas, and of Rev. John H. D. Wingfield, D.D., as Missionary Bishop of Northern California.

THE HYMNAL.

A message (No. 62) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in Message No. 48 of the House of Deputies so far as relates to the first resolution contained therein (concerning the Hymnal).

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops does not concur in the second resolution of Message No. 48, from the House of Deputies, for the reason that in their judgment it is inexpedient at this time to suggest a revision of the Hymnal at an early day."

On motion of Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut, it was

"Ordered, That this House adhere to its action on the second resolution referred to in the message, and ask for a committee of conference thereon."

Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island, Rev. Dr. Rudder, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Trowbridge, of Michigan, were appointed the committee on the part of this House.

CLOSING EXERCISES.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Closing Exercises of the General Convention on the part of this House, to whom was referred the invitation of the Rector and Corporation of the Church of the Holy Trinity to meet in the edifice in which that congregation worships, offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House returns its grateful acknowledgments to the Rector and Corporation of the Church of the Holy Trinity for their courteous invitation, but this House is unwilling to leave the chapel in which its deliberations have been held, most generously placed at its disposal by the vestry of Trinity Church, which it is believed will be sufficiently convenient for the final exercises of the General Convention."

THOS. F. DAVIES, Chairman.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House adjourned until to-morrow at nine o'clock A.M.

TWENTY-FIRST DAY.

FRIDAY, October 30.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Charles S. Spencer, of Delaware. The Lessons were read by Rev. Theodore P. Barber, of Easton. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. William H. Clarke, of Georgia. The Benediction was pronounced by the Right Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., Bishop of Albany.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

TESTIMONIALS OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House do now proceed to sign the testimonials of the Missionary Bishops-elect for Northern and Western Texas and Northern California."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Cannot this be done this afternoon?

The PRESIDENT. At any time during the day.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. There is no necessity to suspend business for that?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Oh, no; it saves the time of the House. The testimonials are at the desk, and can be signed by members during the day.

The resolution was agreed to.

SECRET SESSION.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that we go into secret session this afternoon at four o'clock. That will give ample time; and it is important that the work should be completed.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House sit with closed doors this afternoon at four o'clock, to act on nominations of Missionary Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky. I am instructed by the Committee on Elections to report that leaves of absence for the remainder of the session have been granted to Rev. Mr. Munford, and Messrs. Daniel and Dotterer, of the Diocese of Florida; Rev. Mr. Goodwin, of Rhode Island; Rev. Dr. Sullivan, of Illinois; Rev. Mr. Pettis, of Kentucky; Rev. Dr. Norton, of Virginia; Mr. Dawson, of Alabama; Mr. Simpson, of Missouri; Mr. Whittle, of Georgia; Mr. Battle, of North Carolina; Mr. Baldwin, of Michigan; Mr. Hazelhurst, of Pennsylvania, and Messrs. Cuyler and Parshall, of Western New York.

The Committee further report that Rev. F. M. Gregg has presented satisfactory evidence of his appointment as Supplementary Deputy, in place of Rev. Edward Sullivan, D.D., of the Diocese of Illinois.

BOARD OF MISSIONS.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. The Committee on the Foreign and Domestic Missionary Society are ready to present the resolutions which were recommended yesterday. Allow me to say in advance of what I am about to present, that it is fair to the Committee to say that the resolutions offered by them yesterday morning were put into their hands by the Board of Missions. They acted but as their mouth-piece, and as those resolutions came before the Committee only a moment or two in advance of our coming into the House, some of us (and among them the Chairman), who had not been present at the meeting of the Board the night previous, were not quite prepared to defend them or even to understand them. Those resolutions, so far as objected to, were recommitted, and under the new shape which one of them has taken, under the direction of the Board of Missions, it is now brought before you this morning:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the twelfth article of the Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America be amended by adding to it the following words:

"It being understood that the provisions of this article do not preclude the Executive Committee from making pecuniary appropriations in aid of missions under the care of other churches in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, or of employing laymen or women who are members of this Church to do missionary work."

If it be needful, I will explain, but if there be no call for explanation I offer the resolution for adoption.

The resolution was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I also offer the following from the Committee:

"Whereas, The proposed increase in the Episcopate for Domestic and Foreign Missions, and the call for greater efficiency in missions to the Indian and the colored races, evinces a large development of missionary zeal and faith, and will require a liberal supply of men and money; therefore,

"Resolved, That each parish minister be requested to disseminate information likely to develop an intelligent zeal for missions, and also to form organizations that each parish may become a missionary training-school, and that contributions for missions may be systematically collected."

I move the adoption of that resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. Mr. President, if you will allow me, while on the floor, I will present a resolution that has been placed in my hands:

"Resolved, That the action of this House in re-appointing the members of the Committee of Laymen on Indian Affairs be communicated to the House of Bishops for their concurrence, the said Committee consisting of Messrs. William Welsh, John W. Andrews, John W. Stevenson, Hugh W. Sheffey, Benjamin Stark, and Henry A. Hayden."

The SECRETARY. I would state in regard to this matter, that this House appointed the Committee of its own motion, as was the case at the last General Convention. The House of Bishops has agreed to act in this matter, and sent down a message informing us that with our concurrence they would appoint such a Committee. As we have already appointed the members of that Committee, it now seems but just that we should send to the House of Bishops the names of those whom we have appointed, for them to confirm or reject, as they please.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. By the action of the Committee on Canons this morning I am authorized to ask general consent to bring in a matter of new business in order to have it referred to that Committee. If I have general consent, I should like to present it to the House immediately.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I move that the rule be suspended in order that we may hear what it is.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. It is simply this: After the first sentence of the first subsection of the seventh section of Canon 13 of Title I, page 61 of the Digest, relating to the nomination and election of Missionary Bishops, it is moved to refer this resolution:

"Resolved, That"—at the place I have mentioned—"these words be inserted: 'and if the nomination'"—that is made by the Bishops—"and if the nomination is made during, or within six months before, the meeting of the General Convention, the House of Bishops shall nominate at least two persons for each missionary district for which a Bishop is to be chosen; and a majority of all the clerical and of all the lay votes cast by Dioceses in the House of Deputies shall be necessary to an election."

The object of this resolution is exceedingly simple. As the Canon stands, the House of Deputies is requested to elect a Bishop on a nomination made by the House of Bishops. As the fact stands, the House of Bishops elect the Bishop, and the House of Deputies simply confirm or reject the Bishop elected and sent down by the House of Bishops. It is felt by many of us to be a hardship, that in voting on such nominations we are obliged either to confirm an election or to reject a brother. It is felt that it may sometimes be exceedingly damaging to a man simply to be rejected after being nominated, and improperly damaging to a man. Hence many of us have felt that we should like to have at least two names sent down to us, that there might be a reality in the power of election, and that though one brother be preferred the other brother is not of necessity rejected.

I move this resolution: that after the first sentence of the first subsection of Section 7, of Canon 13, of Title I, these words be inserted:

"And if the nomination be made during, or within six months before, the meeting of the General Convention, the House of Bishops shall nominate at least two persons for each Missionary District for which a Bishop is to be chosen, and a majority of all the clerical and of all the lay votes cast by Dio-

césés in the House of Deputies shall be necessary to an election."

I move that this be referred to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. That can only be done by general consent.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I object. It would lead to debate. It is a very debatable question, in my judgment.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. The thing is simply this, the names of reputable clergy are sent down to us whose character we do not want to injure. If simply one man is sent down there is almost always a feeling that that one man has been rejected for some cause or other. If you take the principle that the gentleman from Alabama has brought forth from Christian antiquity, then in that case there is no difficulty, and no man's character is injured.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Allow me, I have been so much pressed about it that I withdraw my objection to the reference of this proposition.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I wish to enquire what is the precise motion, to suspend the rules, or to act on the proposed amendment?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I move to refer it to the Committee on Canons.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is to refer this resolution to the Committee on Canons.

The motion was agreed to.

REPUBLICATION OF EARLY JOURNALS.

The SECRETARY submitted the following report:

"The Joint Committee on the Republication of the Early Journals, dating its first appointment back to the Convention of 1859, and charged with a duty which for many years had occupied the attention of the General Convention, respectfully report that the objects of their appointment having been accomplished so far as the Republication of the Journals of the Conventions 1785-1835 inclusive are concerned, they beg leave to be discharged. The Committee, as a simple matter of justice, would state that the editorial labor in the preparation of this reprint, extending over a period of twelve years, has been performed without cost to the Convention or the Church, and that by the addition of a volume of historical papers prepared from the MSS. in the Archives of the Church by the Historiographer, which the publishers of the present edition regard as ensuring the sale of the reprint, and the preparation of which was also a labor of love, the plates of the reprinted journals, after the publication of a limited number, become the property of the General Convention, and give for the future the means for the reissue of the whole series of our journals when that shall be deemed desirable.

"The Committee have instructed the Secretary of the Convention to purchase for the Convention the twenty-five sets ordered by a preceding Convention, and for the purpose previously designated. All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. POTTER, Chairman of Joint

Committee on the part of the House of Bishops.

WM. COOPER MEAD, Chairman of Joint

Committee on the part of the House of Deputies.

"Resolved, (the House of Bishops concurring) That the Joint Committee on the Republication of the Early Journals be discharged, and that the Convention express its satisfaction at the successful completion of the work committed to its care."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY. By permission of the President I take this opportunity of exhibiting to the Convention the letters which have been received by the Secretary of the Russo-Greek Committee from the Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops, which become a portion of the Archives of the General Convention and are most interesting from their bearing on the great question of inter-communion. The letters are in Modern Greek, and with the seals of the Patriarchs attached; and they are certainly of interest, and translations of them from time to time have been furnished to the Church papers.

[The handsomely bound album containing the letters was handed around for examination by members of the House.]

CONTROVERSIES IN PARISHES.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I beg leave to submit the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 30 from the House of Bishops, proposing certain amendments of Canon 4, Title II, of Differences between ministers and their congregations, and of the Dissolution of Pastoral Connection, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, which will be virtually a concurrence with the House of Bishops in the amendment proposed in the above-mentioned message, except as to Section III, of the Canon, which is to be provided for in a subsequent report from this Committee. The purpose of the particular action recommended is to comply with the provisions of Canon 2, Title IV., as to the form of amending the Canons:

"I. Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, that Section 1 of Canon 4 of Title II. is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. In case of a controversy between any Rector or Assistant Minister of any Church or Parish and the Vestry or Congregation of such Church or Parish, which cannot be settled by themselves, the parties, or either of them, may refer the matter to the Bishop of the Diocese, who may, thereupon, notify each of the contesting parties to furnish him with the names of three Presbyters of the Diocese. The Bishop shall add to them the names of three other Presbyters, and the whole number shall then be reduced to five, by striking off the names alternately by each of the contesting parties. Should either party refuse or neglect to name three Presbyters, or to strike from the list, as aforesaid, the Bishop shall act for the parties so refusing or neglecting. And in all the proceedings aforesaid the Vestry or Congregation, as the case may be, shall be represented by some layman of their number, duly selected by them for the purpose: Provided, that the party or parties applying as above shall have first given the Bishop satisfactory assurance of compliance with whatever may be required of them as the final issue of such proceedings.

"II. As now, except the substitution for the words 'make application to the Bishop of the Diocese who shall' these words 'refer the matter to the Bishop of the Diocese who may.' Printed copy of the section with this alteration, inserted in the original report.

"III. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 5, of Canon 4, of Title II., is hereby repealed.

"IV. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), that section 8, of Canon 4, of Title II., is hereby amended, so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. This Canon shall not be obligatory upon any Diocese which has made, or shall hereafter make, provision by Canon upon this subject, or with whose laws or charters it may interfere."

This is substantially a concurrence of the House

of Bishops. It is only changed a little in form in order to comply with the requisitions of the Canon 4 on that subject. I move that this resolution be adopted by the House.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I should like to have that considered before its adoption. It is a very important matter to us Presbyters.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I desire to know what is the extent of the change effected. I hope that the gentleman who made the report will explain what change is made in the section.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The change made is in the first section of the Canon. It is on page 89 of the Digest. At present I believe the words in the fifth line are "The parties, or either of them, may make application to the Bishop of the Diocese, who shall thereupon." The change, and the only change, is this, "May refer the matter to the Bishop of the Diocese, who may thereupon." That is all.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. It gives the Bishop a discretion?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Makes it more discretionary; that is the whole change. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I object to the adoption of it, and therefore it must go on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

CANON ON RITUAL.

A message (No. 63) from the House of Bishops announced that that House concurred in Message No. 43 from the House of Deputies, with the following amendments:

"1st. Strike out in Subsection 1 of the proposed additional Section 2, to be added to Canon 20, Title I., the words, 'not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines,' and insert in their stead the words, 'which set forth or symbolize erroneous or doubtful doctrines, and ceremonies, and practices, not ordained or authorized by the Book of Common Prayer.'

"2d. Strike out in the same Subsection 2 all those words enclosed within parentheses, beginning with the words, 'and, as examples,' and ending with the words, 'Book of Common Prayer,' being the following words:

(And, as examples, the following are declared to be considered as such:

"a. The use of incense.

"b. The placing, or carrying, or retaining a crucifix in any part of the place of public worship.

"c. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of people as objects toward which adoration is to be made.

"d. Any act of adoration of or toward the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowing, prostrations, genuflections, and all such like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer."

"3d. Strike out in the second subsection of said proposed Section 2, of Canon 20, Title I., the word 'by' in the third line of said Subsection 2, and insert in its stead the words 'or that.'

"4th. Insert in the fourth line of the same Subsection 2, after the words 'authorized as aforesaid' the words 'have been introduced.'"

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that the message be referred to the Committee on Canons.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I second that, with a motion that they be requested to report as soon as possible, and have leave to sit during the session of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

A message (No. 64) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the following clause be added to Section 1, of Canon 1, of Title III., of the Digest:

"[4] The rules of order of the House of Deputies shall be in force in the ensuing General Convention, until the organization thereof, and until they be amended or repealed by the said House."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If I understand that, the House of Bishops merely concur in our rules of order. I move, therefore, that we concur in that message.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I ask that it go on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. It is already on the Calendar. The motion is too late.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move to concur.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I object to that at this time, and I will state my reasons at the proper time.

The PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The message goes on the Calendar.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I submit the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was recommended their report No. 4, relating to Canon 4, Title II., 'Of Differences between Ministers and their Congregations, and of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection,' respectfully report that they have reconsidered the same, and recommend the adoption of the amendments to the said Canon contained in the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Sections 2 and 3 of Canon 4, of Title II., 'Of Differences between Ministers and their Congregations, and of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection,' be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The five Presbyters thus designated shall constitute a Board of Reference to consider such controversy; and shall meet in the city or county in which such rector or assistant minister lives, or elsewhere, as the parties may agree. It shall be the duty of such Board to adjust, if possible, the differences without dissolving the connection between the rector or assistant minister and the vestry or congregation; and for this purpose the Board is empowered to recommend terms of settlement; and if, after hearing such allegations and proofs as the parties may submit, a majority of the Presbyters, the whole Board being present, shall be of opinion that there is no favorable termination of such controversy, and that a dissolution of the connection between such rector or assistant minister and his parish or congregation is necessary to restore the peace of the church and promote its prosperity, such Presbyters shall recommend to the Bishop that such minister shall be required to relinquish his connection with such church or parish, on such conditions as may appear to them proper and reasonable, including the adjustment of all pecuniary claims between the parties.

"Sec. 3. If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop and Presbyters, made in pursuance of such recommendation, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial functions within the Diocese, until he shall retract his refusal; and if he persist in his refusal, it shall be the duty of the Bishop to dissolve the connection between the said rector and vestry or congregation; or if the vestry or congregation shall

refuse to comply with any such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention until they shall have retracted their refusal."

Now let me state in brief what changes are made:

"The five Presbyters thus designated shall constitute a Board of Reference to consider such controversy."

So far, it is as the Canon now reads. Now comes the change:

"And shall meet in the city or county in which such rector or assistant minister lives, or elsewhere, as the parties may agree."

That is to fix the venue and make it not too inconvenient or impracticable for the poor minister, who, in one instance, has been called two hundred or three hundred miles away. Then this is also inserted:

"It shall be the duty of such Board to adjust, if possible, the differences without dissolving the connection between the rector or assistant minister and the vestry or congregation; and for this purpose the Board is empowered to recommend terms of settlement."

In order that this Board may not be constituted merely to consider the dissolution of the connection, but if possible to sustain it by mediation between the parties. Then the Canon proceeds just as at present, excepting at the close, where it is provided that in making terms those terms may include the adjustment of all pecuniary claims between the parties.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. May I ask a question? I see that you have a kind of verdict provided for. Have you also provided by a change in the Canon that those who last give their verdict shall have heard all the evidence? Is that provided for?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. That is provided for.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I did not hear it.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. "If after such allegations and proofs as the parties may submit, a majority of the Presbyters, the whole Board being present," etc.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Does it require that every member shall be present?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. "A majority of the Presbyters, the whole Board being present."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. At the verdict, but not at the hearing of the evidence. Let the report go on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be placed on the Calendar.

RESOLUTION OF THANKS.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I ask the privilege of offering a resolution which I think will cause no discussion and will pass unanimously. If there be any question in regard to the latter portion of the resolution it can be explained in a single moment.

"Resolved, That this Convention tenders its cordial thanks to the Churchmen of New York, for their generous hospitality, and especially to the corporation of Trinity Church for daily entertainment, and the ample accommodations provided for the transaction of business and other acts indicative of their liberality. Also it desires to express its obligations to the rector, wardens, and vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity for the kind and disinterested offer of their Church for the use of the Convention."

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. We have already done that. We returned our thanks for their courteous offer yesterday evening.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. This has reference to the offer of the use of the Church for the whole Convention.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I beg pardon.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. The Chair is my authority for saying that he had a correspondence some time ago on this subject, and it is at his suggestion that I have added this addition to the resolution. I move the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

LECTIONARY FOR LENT, ETC.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I suggest that we go regularly to the Calendar. I move to take it up.

The motion was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The first business on the Calendar is the report of the Joint Committee to prepare a new Lectionary for week days in Lent; and in connection therewith there is a message from the House of Bishops.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I move to pass that by until the Committee on Canons return. That is an important matter. That Committee, one of the most important committees of the House, is in session by leave of the House. I move to pass this by until they return.

The motion was agreed to.

EPISCOPATE IN NEW DIOCESES.

The next business on the Calendar was the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, made on the fifteenth day of the session, respecting the requirement of a fund for the support of the Episcopate, which report submitted the following resolutions for the action of the House:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Fifth Article of the Constitution be amended by striking out the following words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention, until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese.'

"Resolved, That such amendment be notified to the several Diocesan Conventions, in accordance with the Ninth Article of the Constitution, so that the same may be agreed to or ratified by the next General Convention."

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. I ask that the report of the Committee be read. That is the best speech which can be made on the subject.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom was referred the Memorial from the Diocese of Tennessee, asking for an Amendment of Article V. of the Constitution by omitting the words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese,' respectfully report that the clause proposed to be omitted stand as a limitation upon the right of creating any new Diocese from one, or more than one, of the existing Dioceses of this Church. It is a restriction of recent origin, having been first proposed as a Constitutional Amendment by the General Convention of 1868, and ratified by the Convention of 1871. It has therefore been a part of the law of the Church for only three years. The Memorial from the Diocese of Tennessee set forth, as we believe truly, that its necessary operation is to obstruct and delay the proper work of the Church in many parts of the country. There are large Dioceses, especially in the Southern and Southwestern States, coincident in boundary with those States, over the whole of which Episcopal supervision and ministrations is practically impossible, and yet when the Church is so feeble, and the poverty of the people so great, as to render the creation of a fund or endowment for the support

of a new Episcopate impracticable for the time being. Our construction of the clause in question is that it requires such an endowment sufficient for the support of a Bishop to be actually raised, or at least securely provided for.

"In the judgment of the Committee the policy of this restraint is more than questionable. It seems to us more careful of the dignity of the Episcopate than of the spread of the Church or the salvation of the souls of men. Under a different policy, our Church, from a feeble beginning, has grown with the expansion of our Episcopate until we have forty-one Dioceses, while more are needed, or will soon be needed, to carry forward its beneficent work. We begin to feel already the check imposed upon her growth by a constitutional restraint, which requires an endowment first to be raised when a Church can hardly be said to exist. We shall more nearly conform to the missionary spirit of our Church, more truly follow the law of her development, if we first build her up in the destitute places of our land. Endowment will follow an Episcopate, but cannot precede it, except in regions where the Church Communion is already strong, both in numbers and wealth.

"Of the forty-one Dioceses now existing, there are very few in which the Episcopate is supported by the income of an adequate fund. If we refer the enquiry to our whole Church, we shall find that the chief basis of support is parish assessment and contribution. If this be so, the question is full of significance: What would now be the condition of the American Church if, in her infancy, the law of her growth had been reversed by a constitutional limitation, like the one now in question? The support of a new Episcopate is essentially a matter of civil contract between the Bishop-elect and the people who call him to be their Chief Pastor, and we see no sufficient reason for restraining their action by organic law. The elected Bishop, who is chiefly concerned in the question, may have the means of self-support, and if, with the zeal of a Peter or a Paul, a Wilson or a Selwyn, he is ready to carry the message of his Divine Master where it is most needed, ought we to arrest his steps by a law which certainly would have a strange significance in Apostolic days? Or, he also may be poor and yet willing to share the poverty of those to whom he is sent, relying on them to provide for humble wants, and relying yet more on the sustaining power of Divine Providence.

"The Committee recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolutions:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Fifth Article of the Constitution be amended by striking out the following words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention, until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese.'

"Resolved, That such amendment be notified to the several Diocesan Conventions, in accordance with the Ninth Article of the Constitution, so that the same may be agreed to or ratified by the next General Convention.

(Signed) "CHARLES H. HALL, Chairman."

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. Before the resolutions are adopted, I have something to say. It will be found that prior to the introduction of the change which was made in 1868, there was another restraint put upon the endless multiplication of Dioceses, divisions and subdivisions interminable, and that provision was:

"No such new Diocese shall be formed which shall contain less than fifteen self-supporting parishes, or less than fifteen Presbyters, who have been at least

one year canonically resident within the bounds of such new Diocese."

It was thought that this was requiring too large a number of Presbyters, and too large a number of self-supporting Parishes, and, therefore, the number was reduced, as will be seen by the next clause of the Fifth Article, as it now stands, to six self-supporting Parishes and six Presbyters. But as a set-off to this great reduction of the number of Parishes and Presbyters, it was found absolutely necessary, in order to sustain the dignity of the office or to secure suitable provision for a Bishop who might be elected and then left without support, and be in a worse position than a parish minister, to introduce this provision, to which objection is now made: "Until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese."

Strike that out and where are you? Any Diocese may be subdivided so that there are only six parishes and six Presbyters in a new Diocese that may be erected. Are you prepared to allow that without the assurance of a support for the Bishop, and will it be possible for six parishes and six Presbyters to support suitably the Episcopate? Have we any assurance that they will be able to continue to exist as self-supporting parishes, even if they are such at the time they make the application?

Look at the article which exists in our Constitution as it stands before us in the Journal of 1871. I happen to be the Chairman of the Committee on New Dioceses, and I am able to state what interpretation that Committee—after mature deliberation, after a full discussion, in which we all harmonized—put upon this provision: "Until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese." We all know the fact that the large Diocese of Virginia has not one dollar of Episcopal fund, that it prefers not to have a dollar of fund, for various and, as we conceive, good and substantial reasons, the first being that we deem it a matter of principle that each generation should supply itself with the means of grace. "The laborer is worthy of his hire"—from whom? From the ancestors of those to whom he ministers? Assuredly not. We therefore make provision that each year the then communicants of the Church shall contribute ratably one dollar apiece; the parishes are assessed, but the rate is according to the number of communicants. The result is not a particle of difficulty in raising enough for the support of our Bishops. We know of instances where this plan exists in other Dioceses, and it has worked well. There is a further reason why, as I conceive, in regard to funds, there are various difficulties and objections. In the first place, they are not absolutely secure. Riches, in the form of an Episcopal fund, as well as in other forms, may take to themselves wings and fly away.

In the next place such things expose parties to temptation to defraud the Church, and there are numberless cases on record in which scandal has been brought on the Christian Church and name by speculations in church funds. We therefore prefer the plan we pursue.

Again, and lastly, we have acted under the conception that this language does not require an endowment. That word is not used, and my memory is clear that the objection was raised in 1868 and overruled, and it was held that no endowment was required. It was left to the Committee on the Admission of new Dioceses in the first instance, subject to the ruling of this body, to say whether or not any provision made was sufficient or suitable, and whether they had satisfactory assurance of its being provided. In the case of the two Dioceses absolutely admitted in this Convention, the provision is pre-

cisely that of Virginia. In the case of the new Diocese in Ohio, the Committee had before them the fact that for fifteen years, I think, the support of both Dioceses had been provided by assessment on the parishes, which had always been properly paid. They had the further assurance that in the new Dioceses the larger proportion of that support had been contributed, and that all the prominent parishes had given assurances by letter that they would continue to pay their assessments, and, if necessary, pay twenty-five per cent. more. The Committee therefore ruled that that was a sufficient provision for the support of the Episcopate, and that it was absolutely more sure than any invested fund that the Diocese could hold, inasmuch as it was the obligation of every parish in the proposed new Diocese, and the number was abundant to provide a support. In the case of Wisconsin, where another Diocese is set off, partial provision was made by an endowment to the extent of fifteen thousand dollars, and the rest provided for by assessment. Now, I contend that there is nothing in this language to establish the ruling which the Committee on Constitutional Amendments has adopted; but suitable provision in both these cases was made for the Episcopate, and we had satisfactory assurance that it was made. Therefore, I do not see any necessity for striking out this clause. On the contrary, there is strong reason for its continuance.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. Mr. President, I hoped that the time of the Convention would not unnecessarily be occupied with this subject, and therefore I contented myself with requesting that the report of the Committee be read. But as the question of the construction of this clause is brought up, I will state as an historical fact that in 1871 the Diocese of Illinois did apply for the division of that Diocese, and that the House of Bishops did rule not only that it meant an endowment, but that it meant an endowment of forty thousand dollars. Now, from the very language of the provision, if it means anything, it does mean endowment.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to put in a remembrancer there? With regard to the application from Illinois, I was not Chairman then, but a member of the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses; and in that case no assurance was given. It was only said that thirty thousand dollars would be raised; there was no assurance that it would be raised.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, of Tennessee. I think that the logical sequence and construction of that clause is that it does mean endowment; for otherwise how can you have "satisfactory assurance"? In what other form can anybody be bound than by obligation or endowment of some kind? If it means the ordinary parish assessment, that varies from year to year. You cannot give a satisfactory assurance for this year, or next year, or any subsequent year in that way. You cannot bind a parish for the future. Its legislation is annual legislation. It rests with the Wardens and Vestry, and whether they pay their assessment or not is a matter with them. There is no legal obligation upon them. If it means that, if it means simply an assessment on the parishes, then what is the necessity of the clause at all?

Is not the matter sufficiently guarded without this? How can you divide a Diocese? Are you not obliged to have the action of the Convention of that Diocese? Have you not the feeling in the Diocese of preserving its unity to guard against any frivolous or unnecessary subdivision? Does not every Diocese desire to retain its greatness, its historic character and associations? You have, therefore, when you come to divide a Diocese, a large

conservative influence that goes against division in every case. But when the Diocese is satisfied in the Diocesan Convention that it would be for the benefit of the Church in that Diocese, that it should be divided, and they pass that resolution, you have still the further check that it must have the assent of the Bishop of that Diocese. You have, therefore, his sense of dignity, and of jurisdiction, and everything of that kind to contend against. If he too is satisfied that the Diocese should be divided, why not let it be done? Have you not in these two provisions a sufficient guard against any unnecessary subdivision?

If, as is contended by the Clerical Deputy from Virginia, the clause means nothing but an assessment, it is useless, because that assessment will necessarily be made, and each Diocese can best arrange that matter, either as they do in Virginia, by putting a dollar on each communicant, or as they do in Tennessee, by assessing so much on the parish, or by any other rule that may seem best to them for providing for the support of the Episcopate. It is not to be supposed that any Diocese would go blindly into subdivision, would call any gentleman to be a Bishop without providing a satisfactory support for him. And why should there be a difference made in the case of a subdivided Diocese from a new Diocese formed out of a missionary jurisdiction? If one of our missionary jurisdictions wishes to be erected as a Diocese, do you require from them any satisfactory assurance of the support of the Episcopate? None whatever. Why then should you put a restriction upon what is really missionary ground in the whole South and Southwest, a prohibition of that kind which does not apply to the missionary jurisdictions? There is no equality in the provision. Moreover, it has operated, and it does operate as a practical obstacle and prevention on the part of the Southern and Southwestern Dioceses from any effort at such division. Have you any application here from any Southern or Southwestern Diocese for division? None whatever. Whatever may be the value of this provision as respects the older and larger Dioceses which have funds or can procure endowments, it is utterly inapplicable to us, and prevents us from having any division whatever; and we are in danger of wearing out our Bishops, of putting them in an early grave by overwork, and checking the growth of the Church by this provision. I hope the resolution will pass.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. Mr. President, I was exceedingly glad when the Deputy from Tennessee presented the motion, to refer this matter to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. When this article was sent down to the various Dioceses six years ago as an amendment to the Constitution, the Diocese of Alabama voted against the amendment simply on account of the clause which is now under consideration. The Deputies were instructed to vote "no" in the Convention. When, however, the Convention assembled, we determined to vote "aye," with the hope that at this Convention a motion would be made to strike out what the Diocese of Alabama considered the objectionable clause; and if I remember aright—for this is only the third Convention that I have been permitted to attend as a Deputy—the object contemplated by the change in the Constitution originally sent down to the Dioceses was in order to relieve especially the Diocese of Texas. The application was made for reducing the number of clergy required so that that Diocese might thereby be divided. The clause, however, which was inserted in the amendment of the Constitution actually put a stop upon any proceeding on the part of the Diocese,

and we have now elected two Missionary Bishops to be sent to Texas, simply because the Diocese of Texas was unable to provide for what would have been better a division of that Diocese itself.

I speak, sir, as a Southern man when I say that if this Convention had taken any means in order to prevent the division of Dioceses, they could not possibly have taken a more effectual one than the one adopted at the last Convention. It is utterly impossible for any Southern Diocese, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, to divide upon the plan which has now been accepted. Gentlemen may talk as they please about that provision, it has been ruled, and is so understood, that it means either that there must be an amount of \$30,000 raised and invested, or that there must be a sufficient guarantee that the Episcopate shall be supported from such a fund. I hold that in itself is wrong. When I was admitted to the diaconate and priesthood the only guarantee that I received that I should ever have bread for my family was the grand fundamental principle that the man who served at the Altar should live by the Altar. There was not a solitary word said in reference to any support; and I hold that we have no right whatever to require any Diocese to guarantee any fixed amount in order to support the Bishop. When Paul was called to his work, what was it? He was told to go and learn what he was to suffer for the cause of Christ, and not to receive five or six thousand dollars a year for his support, and the Bishop has no more right to have any guarantee when a Diocese comes to be divided, except the same which is given to every priest of the Church of God, that if he serves at the Altar he shall therefore partake of the Altar.

Let us look at this question for a moment in its practical bearings in reference to a large portion of the country over which the Church has jurisdiction at present. Take the Southern Dioceses; the extent of the territory there is well known to every member of this Convention. There are Dioceses to-day that could divide as far as their number of clergymen is concerned, and at the same time would undoubtedly provide a fund; but gentlemen will please bear in mind that that support is now required to be guaranteed before the Diocese divides. Take, for example, the Diocese of Alabama. If that Diocese desired now to divide, it not only has to have a sufficient number of clergymen, but to bring up a guarantee from the Diocese which is formed from the old one, that a certain amount has been secured for the Bishop, without knowing who that Bishop is that is to be elected; whether perhaps he may not be a single man who can live on a comparatively small amount; whether the lot might not fall upon one who has means of his own which he would be glad and willing to spend in the service of the Church. I hold that the question of support is a thing that belongs to the nominee alone, and not to this Church. When a clergyman is called to a parish, it is for him to decide whether the support which is offered to him is sufficient to enable him to live, and not for the Church to say that the rector shall have a certain amount secured to him before he shall be permitted to hold that cure. What would be a sufficient amount for one man would be quite a princely income for another. What would be a princely income to one man, and in one place, would be a very small amount to another. What would be sufficient in this great Diocese of New York, if it was to be divided and the city of New York set apart as a separate Diocese, would be a fortune to a man in the northern part of Alabama, or the northern part of Georgia or in Texas. I hold that the principle is entirely wrong; and if this Convention desire to stop for fifty years the growth of the Church

in the South and Southwest, they can take no better means than preserving this single article of the Constitution as it is. If they desire now to check entirely what this Convention has labored to place its seal to—the reduction of the jurisdiction of the Bishops so as not to be appointing one man to supervise such a large portion of country—this article will be retained as it is. The Convention has already given its seal to that principle, and here is an embargo to the very action which, by their conduct six years ago, in sending this article to the various Dioceses, and three years ago in ratifying it solemnly, they committed themselves to.

Now let every Diocesan Convention decide for itself in this matter. As it has been well said, there can be no danger in it. The Bishop himself, occupying the position that he does, can always check a division, he can always stop it, and if he conceives that from any motive whatever there is an attempt to divide the Diocese so that there is no reasonable chance of giving a new Bishop a support, he can stop it. He has the whole thing before him. He understands the nature and wants of the case. If you remove that restriction, each Diocese with its Bishop can decide for itself when the time comes—a question which, in my judgment, has nothing whatever to do with the division of the Diocese—the amount which the new Bishop who is to be elected shall receive for his report. I vote, not only on my own part, but in discharging a duty which was laid upon me by the Diocese of Alabama three years ago, to refer this change, as I suppose this will have to be referred again, to the various Dioceses for their concurrence, to be acted on finally at the next Convention.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I had the honor to be in the Convention of 1868, when the clause now under consideration was adopted, and I took considerable interest in it, and for the reason stated by the clerical member from Virginia, that in the change of the Constitution in reference to creating new Dioceses, and allowing a small number to unite in forming a Diocese, it was very important that some check should be put upon those divisions, in order that a Bishop should not be created and be liable to be thrown destitute upon the world, to become a disgrace to the Church by the neglect to furnish him with his bread and his clothes. I was heartily in favor of making some reasonable provision, believing that the position of a Bishop differed materially from that of a Presbyter, that his resources were far more limited, that he could engage in no worldly pursuit without disgrace to his cloth; and I deemed it exceedingly important that some moderate, suitable provision should be made for him. The language of this clause allows various modes by which that provision shall be made, and it was well considered at that time. It does not involve the necessity of creating an endowment or a sum of money invested. It does not necessarily require that, and it is perfectly easy to escape all the dangers attending an endowment or investment in securities by a very simple process, which shall secure the support of the Bishop, and, at the same time, not require the formation of a fund which will be liable to robbery or to loss.

I will instance the Diocese of New Jersey, and the policy which is there pursued. The fund for the support of the Episcopate is formed in this way: the parishes pledge themselves that they will contribute so much per annum, or what is equivalent to a certain amount per annum. That is to say, if a parish pays its clergyman \$1,500 salary, it gives a bond, bearing seven per cent. interest, for that amount to go into the Episcopal fund, and they may at their option pay the interest on that bond, and suffer it to run indefinitely. It is a solemn pledge on their part to an engagement that they

will pay seven per cent. per annum on that amount towards the support of the Episcopate. This bond is not liable to any loss or robbery, and it imposes no obligation on the parish except that it shall pay the interest on that bond. On a fifteen hundred dollar bond it pays one hundred and five dollars a year towards the support of the Bishops. It is a very simple process, and has been a very effective process.

When the Diocese of New Jersey came before this body for a division, we showed to the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, of which I was a member, that we had made a suitable provision in that way to a certain extent, and an additional provision in the way of assessments to another further extent, that we had effectually secured a pledge from the parishes of the new Diocese that the Bishop would not be thrown destitute upon the world and become a disgrace to the Church.

I hope this clause will not be stricken out.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. Mr. President, I hope this House will not concur in the amendment sent down to us from the House of Bishops, and that with the understanding that the provision made in the Constitution, as it now stands, is not to be construed to require an endowment.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. Allow me to suggest this has not been sent down by the House of Bishops; it is only reported from our Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I hope it will not be concurred in, and that for the reason that I do not believe that the article, as it now stands, requires an endowment; and the best evidence we have on that point is that we have already assented to the division of two Dioceses without any endowment. It seems to me that that is evidence enough of the construction placed on the present clause in reference to the securing the Bishop's support. If it required an endowment, I should object to it for two reasons. One is that it separates the Bishop too much from the people whom he is to serve; and I think that in this day it is important that the Bishop should be brought in the closest relations to the people, just as it is important that the Presbyter should be brought in close relations to the people. The Bishop should be to a large extent dependent on the Laity and Presbyters of the Diocese; thus giving an assurance and a guarantee that he will serve them to the best of his ability, and by thus serving them, dwelling with them, and doing good to them, he will ensure the fact that he has really been sent.

My friend, the Clerical Deputy from Alabama, spoke of his entering upon the diaconate, and then upon the priesthood, and accepting parishes without any satisfactory assurances of suitable provision. Why, sir, certainly he had some offer of salary before he went to this parish or that parish.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. I merely said that I was ordained without any such assurance.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. The difference between a Deacon or Presbyter and a Bishop is this: If a Presbyter takes charge of a parish and finds that he is not supported there, he may resign at any time and go where he can be supported; but when a Bishop is elected to a Diocese and consecrated therefore, he is fixed for life, and there he is required to remain, unless he sees fit to resign, which as understood now, according to the spirit prevailing in the Church, is not to be done. But there is suitable provision made for the support of the Bishop when there is an offer made on the part of the Diocese of such and such salary for him, and if he goes there, and dwells

there, and is doing good, there is no question of it that provision will always be made. Therefore I act, understanding the construction already placed on this article of the Constitution to be that this clause does not require an endowment. I also think it is important that satisfactory assurance shall be given for the support of the Bishop just as this article provides; but as the Clerical Deputy from Virginia said, suppose we strike out this clause, then we open the door for the indefinite multiplication of Dioceses and for the indefinite multiplication of Bishops. All that is required, then, after the consent of the already existing Diocese and Bishop is obtained, is that six Presbyters and six Parishes exist in order that a Bishop may be elected and consecrated.

For these reasons, I think we ought not to accept the amendment proposed by the Committee.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I wish to say a word respecting the views that prevailed in the Committee on Constitutional Amendments in support of this amendment.

What seems most important for this House to know is the meaning of the clause of the Constitution which it is proposed to strike out. What it says is that this Convention shall not give its consent to the formation of a Diocese out of another Diocese or out of more than one Diocese, unless it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate. The unanimous opinion of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, was that those words can only mean one thing, a provision which is good and valid and permanent according to a law of the State in which the Diocese exists. If it does not mean that, it is not a provision. It must be a provision, not for one year only but for the permanent support of the Bishop. If it does not mean this permanent support, then it is not a provision for his support; it does not mean anything of any importance, and it ought not to be in the Constitution. Every other means, except a fund or endowment, for taking care of a Bishop must rest in some form or other on the basis of voluntary contribution; and gentlemen rise on this floor and say that will do. Now, just what you want to do, is to take out of the Constitution the clause which says that will not do.

I have stated the amendment. The Constitution declares that adequate provision must first be made for the support of the Bishop. We report to strike that out. I say that means a permanent provision; it means a legal provision, which can be enforced in the courts of law; and it must mean a fund, the income of which will for all time support a Bishop. If it does not mean that, it is insensible and has no place in the Constitution, and ought not to be there.

We thought that was not according to the missionary spirit of this Church. Endowment may, and no doubt will follow the establishment of the Diocese, but it cannot precede it except in those parts of the country where the Communion of this Church is already large and wealthy. This Church has grown up to its present size, how? We have now forty-one Dioceses in these United States. Did the Episcopal fund precede the creation of these Dioceses and of these Bishops? I put the question to every member of this House, where would the American Church have been to-day if this had been the law of her growth? She never would have grown to her present magnitude and importance.

This matter of supporting the Bishop is a matter of civil contract between the parties; and why should we interfere by rule of ecclesiastical organic law to prevent the parties from making such arrangements as they please about it? Your proposed Bishop may be a man of wealth, and he may yet have in him the true missionary spirit of this Church—willing to go to the people which invites

him and carry the message there of his Divine Master. Why should we interfere by the Constitution, and say to him that he shall not do it? I do not wish to deny that there should be some checks upon the multiplication of Dioceses; and you have these. There is the one suggested by the learned Deputy from Virginia; and if he thinks the check of six Parishes and six clergymen is not sufficient, I will go with him to render that check somewhat more effective. There can be no objection to that; but it is one thing to check the growth of the Church by a Constitutional provision, which requires that you shall have an endowment before you have a church at all. I think that is eminently wrong in principle.

Mr. MARTIN, of North Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I rise to a question of privilege. This report is signed by seven members of the Committee, and was not signed by all. I will explain why I did not sign it. I admit that the Church cannot be extended with this provision in the Constitution. The reason I could not sign the report was because it contained the following sentence—a provision which was adopted by wise men, pious men, having the good of the Church at heart: “It seems to us more careful of the dignity of the Episcopate than of the spread of the Church or the salvation of the souls of men.”

I could not sign a report containing that statement.

Mr. MARTIN, of North Carolina. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the remarks that have been made by the Deputy from Central New York, and I have only to add thereto a statement of the effect which this provision has had in the Diocese of North Carolina. The Diocese of North Carolina desired particularly to be divided, but on account of this provision, as they understood it—and they understood it as the Deputy from Central New York has explained—they could not do so under the Constitution; and therefore they resorted to the mode of asking, first, for an Assistant Bishop, and then electing an Assistant Bishop, because there was no provision requiring any specific arrangement for his support. The assent was granted and an Assistant Bishop of North Carolina was elected, and provision has been made for his support. The Diocese of North Carolina made special provision in its application, pledging itself to a division so soon as it could comply with the requisites of the Constitution. We are therefore particularly interested that this amendment should pass. We desire to be divided. That has been the desire of North Carolina for years past. It is too large for one Diocese, apart from other considerations; but we particularly desire a division, instead of an Assistant Bishop. The Diocese so pledged itself when it asked to be divided, and at the last session of the Diocesan Convention there was a decided inclination to ask to be divided, under the impression that no requirement could be asked but the fulfillment of this provision when we had an Assistant Bishop; but it was thought best, as he had only been elected and consecrated within a few months, that the matter should be passed over until the next General Convention. For these reasons the Diocese of North Carolina desires that this amendment should prevail.

Rev. Mr. GREGG, of Illinois. I have only a few words to say about this subject. In my judgment, this clause of Article 5 of the Constitution does mean endowment. Four years ago, the Convention of the Diocese of Illinois unanimously voted to divide the Diocese, with the consent of the Bishop, which was given. The Convention then appointed a committee to sit during the year, and that committee sat a number of times, and it was

ascertained during the course of the year that the endowment could not be raised; and so, at the next Convention, certain resolutions were adopted on the subject, proposing that we should make application at the next General Convention for permission to divide, upon the condition that during the following year, and before dividing and erecting a new Diocese, we should raise some thirty thousand dollars. Our papers went into the House of Bishops, and the House of Bishops said “No; that clause in the Constitution means endowment.” The papers laid before this House were then withdrawn. A few months ago before the death of our Bishop, the work was undertaken again, and we undertook to raise an endowment, and we raised about seventeen thousand dollars towards the endowment of the proposed Diocese in Southern Illinois, which is to contain a population of 1,200,000 people. When the death of the Bishop occurred our work in this direction stopped, and when we met in Convention we decided that it would not be worth while to come here with a proposed endowment of \$17,000 in the form of parochial pledges. And so the subject was dropped. This clause of Article 5 of the Constitution has stood in the way of the growth of the Church in the Diocese of Illinois for years, and I think that our Diocese will vote unanimously in favor of adopting this report of the Committee.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. Falling in with the strain of remark of the gentleman last on the floor, I submit that according to the ruling of the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses, the Article of the Constitution is calculated to mislead us, and, therefore, if retained, it ought to be made more expressive, and I will try in a moment to substantiate my point by relating the experience of the Diocese which I am permitted to represent on this floor. The Diocese of Michigan has been divided during the past year. When the matter came before our Convention, it was in the mind of certain brethren who desired to set off the new Diocese that they might make some annual provision, as was proposed to be made in the Diocese of Illinois. The Journal of the General Convention was opened, and the gentlemen were pointed to the action of the General Convention in reference to that application. They saw at once that they could not carry out any such plan; and though they were a little discouraged, they went out of the Convention to try to raise a fund, and most happily they succeeded, and when they came here at the opening of this Convention with their application, they brought the evidence with them that they had secured a *bona fide* endowment of \$85,000. Now, it seems they acted under a misconception. I am very glad to know that that misconception existed, and I think it is an ignorance for which they will be very glad before the close of their diocesan life. But I think that case serves to show that the article of the Constitution as it stands is not sufficiently explicit. Let us know what this means. If it is sufficiently simple to promise the support of the Episcopate, then let it be so expressed. But if, on the other hand, it is meant that an endowment of some sort shall be secured, let that be expressed. The ruling of the Committee on the Admission of New Dioceses is not that any endowment is necessary, but simply that the new Diocese shall come, not before this Convention, as I understand, but before that Committee, and state their ability to support the Episcopate.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I think there is force in the argument that has been urged both for and against the striking out of this clause; and while as at present advised I cannot agree to the report of the Committee, yet it does

seem to me that with a little change we may meet the objections and obviate the difficulty. I am opposed to leaving the Constitution as it stands with this clause stricken out, unless we can make a little change in another clause which follows immediately after; for I do believe, as has been said, that it will lead to the multiplication of Dioceses, without that restraint which we ought to have. My suggestion—and I offer the amendment—would be this, that in the second line, after the clause recommended by the Committee to be stricken out, we strike out the word "six," and substitute the word "twelve" therefor, the word "six" occurring twice in connection with "parishes" and with "Presbyters."

Now, while the clause recommended by the Committee to be stricken out does operate, beyond any question, as has been said, to the increase of the Episcopate, I am unwilling, for one, to allow a new Diocese to be made with only six parishes in it, and I do not believe it would tend to the interests of the Church to make so radical a change as that which would be made by merely striking out the clause recommended by the Committee. I understand the distinguished gentleman from Central New York (Mr. Comstock) to say that he would be willing, for one, to allow some more restriction than would exist if this clause were stricken out. He did not indicate this precise one; but it does seem to me that if we have that restriction it will be sufficient for our purpose; and it will take away the great objection, which strikes me with much force, that this assurance of an endowment must be obtained before the new Diocese can be formed. I think that is asking too much. I do not think we ought to have this restriction, and it seems to me that if we can agree to the other it will be a sufficient guard and protection against the improper increase of Dioceses.

Rev. Mr. HANCKEL, of Virginia. I second the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

THE HYMNAL.

A message (No. 65) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had appointed as the Committee of Conference, in relation to the matter of the Hymnal, asked for in Message No. 55, of the House of Deputies, the Bishop of Easton, the Bishop of Vermont, and the Bishop of Massachusetts.

CANON ON RITUAL.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I wish now to make a motion, with the consent of the House, in relation to a matter that ought to be attended to immediately. The Committee on Canons had referred to them a message (No. 63) from the House of Bishops proposing amendments to our Canon on Ritual, which was nearly unanimously passed by this House. The Committee on Canons have had a meeting on the subject, and have instructed me to present this resolution to the House:

"Resolved, That this House do not concur with the amendments proposed by the House of Bishops to the proposed second section of Canon 20 of Title I., and ask for a Committee of Conference."

I offer that resolution, with the permission of the House, for immediate action.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Ought there not to be an explanation by the Committee on Canons before we express an opinion?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It is simply for this reason. If we raise the question here now and discuss it, we shall have no Canon whatever. The only way to get a Canon at all is to act speedily, and not to have a discussion now on what these alterations amount to. It is important for the Committee to meet the House of Bishops, and see whether there is any opportunity of coming to any conclusion, unanimously or otherwise. When it is reported back,

then all these amendments can be discussed, if the House think proper to discuss them.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I should like to hear the amendments which the Bishops propose once more read, in order fully to understand exactly their purport.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. The message is in the hands of the Committee on Canons, and until this question is settled I hold that the House have nothing to do with it. It belongs to the Committee on Canons for the nonce.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I move, as a substitute, that we concur in the amendments of the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. If this discussion goes on, I shall have to insist on proceeding with the regular business.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I am quite sure this House does not know what is included in the message of the House of Bishops, according to the opinion of several members of the Committee on Canons. The motion to concur should not be carried without very great deliberation. If the motion is withdrawn, I have nothing more to say.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. It is not withdrawn unless I hear what the Committee recommend.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I move to lay the motion of the Deputy from Maryland on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the resolution of Dr. Mead non-concurring, and asking for a Committee of Conference.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. It seems to me quite unreasonable that the request of the Clerical Deputy from Maryland should be refused in this manner. ("Order!" "Order!") Why should we not know what is proposed?

The PRESIDENT. The Committee of Conference will bring the whole matter before us.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. That is perfectly true; but we can hardly tell how to vote on this question until we know what we are voting upon.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The message has been read already.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Nobody understood the effect of it, however.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. If the amendment be not read, I shall have to call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT. The message is here now and will be read.

The SECRETARY read the message No. 63 from the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. The House has heard the message.

The SECRETARY. I can read the Canon as amended, if you wish. ["Read I read I?"] The Canon, if amended as proposed by the House of Bishops, will read:

"Sec. 2. [1] If any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters that ceremonies or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion, which set forth or symbolize erroneous or doubtful doctrines, or ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, have been introduced into a parish within his jurisdiction, it shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his Council of Advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2.] If, after investigation, it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that erroneous or doubtful doctrines have in fact been set forth or symbolized, or that ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid have been introduced, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instru-

ment of writing under his hand, to admonish the minister of the parish to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon, the minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be notified, and have opportunity to be heard in his defence. The charges preferred, and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee, shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceedings in the case."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Dr. Mead to nonconcur and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The Committee of Conference will be the Committee on Canons of this House.

BISHOPS OF NEW DIOCESES.

The PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment to the Fifth Article of the Constitution is now before the House.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President and gentlemen, you will remember that when, six years ago, after the portrayal of the wants of the extreme West, and the great necessity there for Episcopal supervision and the division of Dioceses, the General Convention determined with one voice that this Church was a Missionary Church, and would put itself into such harness as that it could do missionary work. Under the old article, fifteen self-supporting parishes were necessary in a new Diocese to be formed. Under the new they were reduced to six. This constitutional change, running through three years, was made with especial reference to the work of the Church in the new portions of its territory and in the broadly extended portions of its old and scattered territory; and yet I would like that you should take notice of this fact. Although it was the unanimous opinion of the Church that something must be done by which the Church could go to her work effectively, and that that something was the division of Dioceses into smaller and more effective working bodies; still there was added a provision to the Constitution that utterly annihilated and did away with the good intention of the Church. I tell you to-day that the Church is worse off under the present Constitution as it stands, than it was under the old. Apply this test to the old divisions as they took place, and I say there was, not one in ten that could have provided or that did so provide as that they could have divided according to the letter or spirit of this constitutional enactment. Our old Dioceses exist, almost all of them, and went into operation under the old Constitution, that was found to be too severe, too onerous, too cramping the Church, too confining in its work, that eliminated from it all its missionary character; and yet nearly every one of those Dioceses went into its effective work under better circumstances than the present article allows. How many of them where there were fifteen parishes that were self-supporting? And, even if there were such, were they prepared to raise \$30,000 or \$40,000 as a fund for the support of the Episcopate? The Church, in the old days, allowed those parishes to judge for themselves. What was then allowed to a Diocese? Remembering that it had a Bishop first to be satisfied; that itself had two sections first to be satisfied—the old Diocese to be contracted, the new one

to be set off—remembering that the Bishop-elect was to be satisfied also, the Church allowed these three parties to judge for themselves, so far as the initiation was concerned; and then remember they came here. This House must be perfectly satisfied that the work is good; it must be satisfied that they can do better work as two Dioceses than as one; that the dignity of the Episcopate is safe; that the Missionary character of the Diocese requires that it be divided; and after we have become satisfied, it goes up to the House of Bishops, and there is the last and ultimate appeal of any enemy of that division. Under the old condition of the Constitution, there were five parties, as there are now, to this setting off or division of the Diocese.

Now, can we not trust the General Church? Can we not trust the House of Bishops to take care of the dignity of its own members? Can we not trust this Convention to take care of the interests of the General Church committed to its care? Can we not trust the old Diocese to decide for itself whether it is better that its limits should be contracted? Can we not trust the new Diocese, in conjunction with all these other authorities, to say whether it will do its work alone, or in communion with the old Diocese? And then, after all, and better than all, can we not trust the godly man who has given his life in two orders, first through the diaconate, and then as a Presbyter, who has given his life without ever asking a single question of whether he was to have staff, scrip, or purse, whether he was to be supported by \$100 or \$1,000 or \$5,000—can we not trust that man, after he has travelled for a time in the path, learned the great burdens that rest upon him as a Presbyter in the Church, learned the great interests committed to his hands as a Presbyter in this Church—can we not trust him to go under the moving of the Holy Ghost, and to accept the Episcopate if called, or not to accept, as to him seems good? Are we to say to him, "When the Diocese has called you, when the General Convention has allowed you to accept, it is undignified for you to step into the shoes of St. Paul, and travel over your territory regardless of whether you are paid by the day or by the year, or not paid at all?" There are men who are ready to take any work that the Church lays upon them, whether it be high or low; whether it brings them a thousand a year or their daily bread; whether they travel in chariots or whether they walk on foot; whether they go in purple, or whether they go in homespun; and they are the men who are needed for Bishops in this Church, and especially for Bishops in this growing country, where homespun is the rule and chariots are not known.

Now it comes to this, shall we go back, as a brother just said, to the twelve parishes, rather than the six? Shall we continue to compel men to have a fund put above them before they can accept the work of God laid upon them, whether they desire it or not? More than this, shall we take from the Church its missionary character, for that is the whole of it? If we are a Church confined to the cities, if we are a Church confined to the rich, if we are a Church confined to the East, then you may well enough have this provision, because the cities, the rich and the East can provide for all that this Constitution requires. But there is an opening West and Southwest, and I take here broad issue with the gentleman who says we are in danger of disgracing the Church and multiplying Dioceses interminably. They are to be multiplied interminably. Before some men in this House die, this country will have 100,000,000, perhaps 200,000,000 of people, and these Dioceses are to go on, if the Church

does its work, multiplying interminably. If I did not believe it, I would see no reason why I should be a minister of the Church in the Great West; I would come back here where money is to be made, and purple and fine linen are to be worn, and take my share. But I believe that my duty is there for the present. I believe that God's army is marching with the star of empire, and that it will only march as it goes officered by the Episcopate and carrying the banner in hands that are authorized to carry it, holding it aloft pure and glowing.

Say to me that the Episcopate will fall into wrong hands! I hope it will always fall into the hands that will never stop to enquire for an hour or a day whether there be that provision provided for in this article yea or nay. I hope too that you will remember, gentlemen, that there are many men so situated in these new countries that they are called by God's Providence into the exact position for Bishops. Now and then grows up one great parish which is well paid; it has a church big enough for a cathedral; and grouped around it is a region of country that may have two, three, five, or seven parishes and not one of them self-supporting; and yet this one great parish has the man, the very man exactly fitted for the oversight and charge of that region. They say to this country "Divide; we will support your Bishop; we will give the Church what it requires, and we will put into his pulpit an assistant beside him, and it will cost nobody a dollar"; and yet gentlemen come here prepared to say, "Oh, no; the dignity of the Episcopate requires that you should have a fund above him; and though he is supported by his parish, it is not dignified." I tell you, St. Paul asked but little of dignity. He asked that the work of God should travel through all lands, and when he went even to the Western Isles, I do not believe he paused to think whether people considered it dignified yea or nay. For six years past, if anxiety and toil and trouble could be coined into time and money, I should have spent money enough and time enough to have built a ship to circumnavigate the globe in simply trying to circumnavigate this one provision of our Constitution, and you have been troubled, Committee after Committee—

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up. Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. A comparison has been drawn between a Missionary Bishop and the Bishop of a Diocese, and it has been stated that we have made no provision whatever for a Missionary Bishop. I insist that that is not so; for when we elect a Missionary Bishop, we pledge this whole Church to his support solemnly.

Another point made by the Lay Deputy from Central New York is, that no lawful provision can be made without money invested in stocks—

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I did not say that. I said there must be some legal adequate provision, the income of which will support the Bishop.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I merely wish to submit to him whether a bond given by a parish in New Jersey, which is a corporate body, and bearing seven per cent. interest annually on the principal, and the bond payable at an indefinite time in the future, is not such a legal obligation as would constitute a proper endowment!

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. To whom given?

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. To the Trustees of the Episcopal Fund.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. The gentleman from New Jersey takes the ground that my argument does not apply to a Missionary Bishop. I believe that the proper way to do this work is to lay off the outlying portions of the Diocese into a new Diocese.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. This is immensely interesting; but there are twelve other reports, I think, of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, about twenty from the Committee on Canons, besides this Ritual matter which comes back on us, and we have only till Wednesday night next at midnight at the farthest. I do not think the Committee has any particular objection to an amendment putting in "twelve" instead of "six," as the number of Presbyters in a new Diocese. [No, no.] Well, let us try it as it is. I hope the debate will cease and the voting begin.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I do hope the resolution as reported by the Committee will be put to the House, to either adopt or reject it.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. There are such grave objections connected with the separation of Dioceses where there are only six parishes and six Presbyters left, so far as the old States, at least, are concerned, that it is utterly impossible for me to vote for the resolution of the Committee. I hope the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota will prevail first.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I wish to enquire of the gentleman from Minnesota if he would accept an amendment, fixing the numbers at "ten" instead of "twelve" as he proposed?

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I will substitute "ten" for "twelve" in my amendment.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to amend the resolution by inserting a modification of the article by changing the number "six" to "ten" where "six" is the term now used.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I hardly think it fair for gentlemen to come here with the advocacy of a proposition, based on the report of a committee, to take nearly the whole time, and then insist upon the question being taken. I have no objection, however, if they will take the question in the form now proposed.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIR put the question, and declared that the nays prevailed by the voices.

A division was called for.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The Diocese of Alabama calls for a vote by orders.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. What has become of the order of the day? The rule of the House is that it shall be taken up at twelve o'clock unless it is dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT. We have been on the order of the day for an hour or two.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. But the order of the day was the appointment of the Rubrical Commission.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I think it is very well for us to understand this matter. The report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments is a simple thing to strike out the words in the Constitution, "and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurances of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese." The second resolution is simply to send down this proposal to the Dioceses. Now, I do not know how any amendment to that proposition can come in by striking out "six" and inserting "ten" anywhere. If you propose to amend the next clause of the Constitution, there ought to be a distinct proposition to that effect.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Allow me to ask the gentleman if there is any difficulty in amending the first resolution in the report by adding to it these words, "Also by striking out the work 'six' wherever it occurs in said article and in-

serting the word 'ten'?" It will all then be one proposition.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I understand you can send down a distinct proposition, and it ought to be distinct and plain, for when it comes back we cannot cross a *t* or dot an *i*; we must pass it *in totidem verbis*. It goes down to the Dioceses, and comes back for our ratification or approval at the next session of the General Convention.

Mr. President, I desire—but I do so with some diffidence in view of the report that has been made by a committee so eminent as that on Constitutional Amendments in this House—to say a single word on the general subject. An evil was felt to exist in this Church arising from the imminent danger of too many subdivisions of Dioceses. That feeling in the Church resulted in the proposal in 1868 to the entire body of the Church to amend the Constitution so as to provide for the clause now sought to be stricken out. That amendment—

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order, and I do it with a good deal of hesitation, with reference to the distinguished Deputy from Virginia. I understand the vote has been taken, and a call for a vote by Dioceses and Orders has also been sent to the Chair. The point of order is whether it is now allowed to debate a question on which the House has already taken a vote.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. If the vote has been taken—"Yes, yes." I understand the question was put on striking out "six" and inserting "twelve." That is not a vote on the main proposition, to send out any amendment to the Dioceses.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. But a call has been made that that vote be further determined by Dioceses and orders.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. That can be demanded at any time, a day or a week before the vote is taken, but it does not cut off debate.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I beg pardon; but can we go on debating other questions when the vote has been taken upon this, and a call for a division by Dioceses and orders has been made on this question?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I understand—

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I ask the Chair.

The PRESIDENT. I will state that the question has been debated very thoroughly upon the report and resolutions of the Committee. Just as the vote was about to be taken upon that question, and I must say it was a surprise to me as a member of the House as well as a surprise to me as an officer of the House; a motion was made in reference to another clause of the article, changing entirely the question. I should like that question to have been fully considered for many days before the change was made; nevertheless I put the question as it was proposed to the Chair and to the House, and I also announced that the result of the vote was that the amendment was lost. Then a division was called for, and the Chair is ready to put the question upon that division.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I submitted the question of order that there was no proposition to which such an amendment appertained.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. And then proceeded to debate the general question.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I had a right to do so.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. The amendment, as I understood, was to make the report palatable to the Convention. A majority were willing to vote for the report of the Committee, provided they understood that this restraint was to follow.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I want an answer from the Secretary to this question: When was the matter brought into this House and referred to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitu-

tion, on which we are now acting, as covered by their report?

The SECRETARY. The report was made on the fifteenth day of the session.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Had this other matter, in regard to the increase of the number of Presbyters and parishes to constitute a new Diocese, been brought up before the sixteenth day?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Then it is new matter, and we have nothing to do with it.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise for a point of information. Did the Chair rule that the motion to increase the number of Presbyters from six to ten was lost?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Then I withdraw the point of order, and we withdraw the call also for a vote by Dioceses and orders.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I ask again for a division on that matter.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. The decision of the Chair was announced, and we acquiesced in it.

The PRESIDENT. A division was called for at the time.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. I hope I may be allowed to say a word to the House as to what we are about to do. If we are not to vote on the increase of the number of Presbyters and parishes—

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I believe the learned Deputy called me to order. I was entitled to the floor unless I was out of order.

Rev. Dr. STRINGFELLOW, of Alabama. If the gentleman will allow me, when I called him to order, I was not aware that the President had decided in reference to the vote previously taken, but supposed that was pending. I ask the Chair, is the question now on the original resolution of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments?

The PRESIDENT. I shall decide with some diffidence, because my own inclination helps, perhaps, to lead me to the decision, that the point made by Dr. Mead is a good one, and that the attempt to increase the number of the parishes as a condition for the formation of the new Dioceses is new matter, and cannot be introduced, therefore the amendment is out of order. The question is on the resolution reported by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. Does the President decide that we cannot amend the proposition of the Committee?

The PRESIDENT. Not by introducing a matter so entirely near as to increase the qualifications.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. That is the very point. I appeal the House that this amendment which we have proposed to us may be amended by adding to it a change in another paragraph of the same article or section of the Constitution. I propose to appeal to the House on that point.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from South Carolina appeals from the decision of the Chair, determining that a proposition to make a change in the number of parishes is new matter.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. If the appeal is debatable, I desire to say one word. Both propositions relate to the same matter. The Committee propose to strike out one of the checks in the Constitution, and the amendment simply proposes to make another check in the same article a little more effectual. I think the Chair has erred in the point of order.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I move that the decision of the Chair be sustained.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. Laying the ap-

peal on the table sustains the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rose before that motion was made. The gentleman from Tennessee made his motion to lay on the table before he was recognized. I have seen gentlemen try all day to get the floor, and I rose before the motion to lay on the table was made, and the gentleman made the motion before he was recognized by the Chair. It is for that reason we have ten people talking at once.

I merely wish to suggest on the point of order, that this decision of the Chair is only important in reference to our business which is to be rapidly done for the few days remaining. When a check is proposed to be taken out of the Constitution and another check on exactly the same matter is to be made stronger, as a reason for taking that out, it will never do to hold that that is new matter, because we shall never be able to do any business in that way. The original proposition is to take off one check on the creation of new Dioceses, and this House is asked by the amendment to say, "We will take out that check if you will make the other check a little stronger."

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I rise to a point of order. I believe in all parliamentary bodies on earth when an appeal is taken from the decision of the Chair, without the slightest debate, the question is put, shall the decision be sustained?

The PRESIDENT. No; that is a mistake. The appeal may be debated *ad libitum*.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I wish to know whether I was recognized when I made a motion to lay the appeal on the table, which leaves the decision of the Chair standing as he has made it?

The PRESIDENT. I had recognized you, but the gentleman from Western New York objected to the recognition as informal.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Tennessee. I make the motion now to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I submit that it is not a parliamentary motion to lay an appeal on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is a common occurrence here. The question is on the motion to lay the appeal on the table.

The motion was not agreed to, there being, on a division, ayes, 63, noes, 92.

The PRESIDENT. It is not necessary, I suppose, to take the vote on sustaining the decision of the Chair, as I consider this vote practically a reversal of it.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. Oh, no! This does not decide that question. I voted on other reasons. I thought it unparliamentary to lay an appeal on the table.

The PRESIDENT. Very well. Then the question will be, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I know that the time of this House is precious, but an important principle is here involved—the right of this House to control its Committees. I understand that the Committee on Constitutional Amendments had referred to them one subject. What was that subject? The question of the Episcopate and the proper provision for the support of the Episcopate. And are six parishes a proper support? That is the point of the amendment. It is true one section of the Constitution provides that you must make suitable provision, and the next section provides that a new Diocese to be formed must have at least six parishes. The Committee on Constitutional Amendments bring in a report on this great subject. What is that report? That a new Diocese may be formed without making suitable provision for a Bishop. Gentlemen say, we

are willing to vote for that, provided twelve parishes or ten parishes are required in the new Diocese; and when that amendment is moved a gentleman rises here and says that we have no right to propose the amendment! How does it stand? The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota was to add to the resolution an additional proposition. Has not the House a right to make a proposition to amend the resolution of this Constitutional Committee? Unless the gentleman from Minnesota is right, that conclusion must be reached, that we can adopt no proposition in this House without reference to a committee. The amendment appertains to the same subject as the original resolution. It may not be in parliamentary form, perhaps, but the proper way would be to add to the report of the Committee an additional section. If that had been adopted, two propositions would be presented to the House, one a proposition to strike out the suitable provision, and the other a proposition to increase the number of Presbyters to ten or twelve, as the case may be, and then the two would form one complete whole.

Now, it is proposed to take from the House its most important privilege—that of controlling its own business. I hope the House will vote understandingly. We now vote on a distinct proposition which is not reported by the Committee, to wit: that there shall be an additional amendment to the Constitution to strike out "six" and insert "ten" or "twelve." When that is done, the question will come up upon the two propositions together.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. I ask for the reading of the record.

The SECRETARY. "The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom was referred the memorial from the Diocese of Tennessee, asking for an amendment of Article 5 of the Constitution by omitting the words, 'and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention,'" etc.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. There was but one thing submitted to the Committee.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee. I desire to say a few words on the question. Am I in order?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir; we are on the appeal now.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee. Then let me hear what is the exact question before the House.

The PRESIDENT. The question is whether the decision of the Chair shall be sustained, ruling that this proposition to change the Constitution by the substitution of "ten" parishes for "six" is new matter, and cannot, therefore, be introduced today.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. May I say only a few words?

The PRESIDENT. If the House will allow you, I am certainly willing.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I hope that this House will sustain the President's decision, in order that we may come to a full sense of the clergy and laity of this House in regard to this matter, whether the Church in the West and Southwest shall be choked off by red-tape. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The question being put, there were on the division, ayes 74, noes 91.

The PRESIDENT. The decision of the Chair is not sustained.

BOARD OF MISSIONS.

A message (No. 66) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House do not concur in the

resolution contained in Message No. 53 from the House of Deputies, relating to conditional action of the Board of Missions, for the reason that this House does not consider itself competent to commit to the Board of Missions such conditional powers."

THE HYMNAL.

A message (No. 67) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House of Bishops concurs in Message No. 48 from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with the following amendment, viz.: To substitute for the last of the resolutions in said message the following:

"Resolved, That the revised Hymnal now set forth is not to be regarded as a finality, and consequently it may be revised whenever deemed desirable; but that, in the judgment of this General Convention, it should not be further revised until it shall have been subjected to the test of actual use for the period of six years."

The SECRETARY. That is the report of the Joint Committee of Conference, I will state.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that we concur in the Joint Committee's report on the Hymnal.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I will say that the Committee were unanimous, and every member of the Joint Committee has signed the report which I have in my hand.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If the Secretary will read it, I think we are prepared to act.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Joint Committee of Conference on the Hymnal recommend concurrence in the Message No. 48, of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with the following amendment, viz.: to substitute for the second of the joint resolutions proposed in said message the following:

"Resolved, That the Revised Hymnal now set forth is not to be regarded as a finality, and consequently it may be revised whenever deemed desirable; but that in the judgment of this General Convention it should not be further revised until it shall have been subjected to the test of actual use for the period of six years."

The resolution was concurred in.

CANON ON RITUAL.

A message (No. 68) from the House of Bishops announced that it had appointed as the Committee of Conference asked for in Message No. 50 from the House of Deputies (relating to the proposed amendment to Section 2, Canon 20, Title I.), the Bishops of Connecticut, North Carolina, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, being its Committee on Canons.

CONCURRENCE IN VARIOUS MATTERS.

A message (No. 69) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurs in Message No. 56 from the House of Deputies (discharging Joint Committee on Republishing Journals), and also concurs in Message No. 57 (proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society), and in No. 58 (reappointing Committee of Laymen on Indian Affairs).

BISHOPS OF NEW DIOCESES.

The PRESIDENT. The report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments is before the House.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee, obtained the floor. Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? I desire, after the decision of the House differing from the decision made by the Chair just now, to ask who was the gentleman that proposed to strike out "six" and insert "ten" or "twelve"?

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. I moved it.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I ask that Mr. Atwater's proposition, by way of amendment, should stand in these words:

"That there be added to the proposition the following language:

"No such new Diocese shall be formed which shall contain less than ten parishes."

Several DEPUTIES. Say twelve.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The proposition is that of the gentleman from Minnesota, and I am only reducing it to form.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. I understand the proposition was made by Judge Comstock originally, and contained the word "twelve."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. It is wholly immaterial so far as I am concerned; I merely wish to get the question properly before the House.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. Is it not simply this, strike out the word "six" where it occurs in two places and insert "twelve"? That was the form, and I proposed it as an addition to the resolution of the Committee.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. But the better form, with all due respect, is that which I suggest, because "six" or "ten" may occur somewhere else.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I have looked it over.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. We should vote on it distinctly as an addition to the proposed resolution of the Committee. I understand that the question now is upon the amendment to strike out "six," so as to make that clause of the Constitution read:

"No such new Diocese shall be formed which shall contain less than twelve self-supporting parishes or less than twelve Presbyters who have been at least one year canonically resident within the bounds of such new Diocese, regularly settled in a parish or congregation, and qualified to vote for a Bishop."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. That amendment to the proposal of the Committee has already been put to the House, voted upon, and declared by the Chair to be lost.

The PRESIDENT. But a division was called for.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. If a division is called for, the Diocese of Alabama calls for a vote by Dioceses and Orders.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I was merely desiring, on a call for a vote by Dioceses, to have the question intelligibly before the House. I did not propose to debate that question at this time. I only desired the question to be put in proper form to the House, so that we could understand it.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I submit that the question which was put was on "ten" and not "twelve," and it was declared that "ten" was not passed, and it is upon the point of "ten" that the division is to be made now, and not on the point of "twelve," as put before us by the distinguished Deputy from Virginia.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. There is a misunderstanding, evidently, here. I beg leave to say that I introduced the amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If you are going to have a vote by orders on "ten," we may have a vote by orders next on "eleven" or "twelve," or any other number, and we shall never get through. Let us first determine whether we want to change that part of the article at all. I suggest that the usual parliamentary rule is to move to strike out "six" and substitute blank. One man may name "twelve" and another "ten," and after taking the vote by orders, as to any change, let us settle by a majority on the number. Otherwise, we shall never get through. After the vote is taken by orders on "ten," I can rise and move to insert

"eleven," and then have another vote by orders, and then I can rise and move "twelve," and have a vote by orders, when the House should determine first, whether it wants any change at all.

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. The precise proposition, as presented by Judge Sheffey, is on my resolution to insert "ten," and in regard to the suggestion of the last gentleman on the floor, I have to say that I think this House will be reasonably satisfied with either "ten" or "twelve." The word, in my original resolution, was "twelve," but on the request of several gentlemen about me I substituted "ten," and that is my resolution at the Clerk's desk, and that is the one which will come before the House. I think the suggestion that other gentlemen here, in case that is carried, will change it one or two either way, is not well taken, for if the substitution of the proposition is acceptable, I think we shall not quarrel about either "ten" or "twelve." The vote then will be this: That we adopt the report of this Committee, striking out the words which they desire, but adding thereto a change in the second line after the words asked to be stricken out by the Committee, by changing "six" to "ten," so as to read:

"No such new Diocese shall be formed which shall contain less than ten parishes or less than ten Presbyters," instead of "six" in each case.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee. I wish to say a word. Have I the right to speak on the proposed amendment?

The PRESIDENT. I think so.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I rise to a question of order. Has anybody a right to speak when we are simply determining whether this question has been lost or not? I do not think any one has a right to speak now.

The PRESIDENT. The question was so indefinitely put before that I think it becomes the discretion of this House to allow the matter to be considered till it is definitely put.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. With that understanding, I am willing that the gentleman shall proceed.

Rev. Mr. GRAY, of Tennessee. I ask the attention of the House to this question for a few moments. I do think this is a matter of very great importance for the consideration of this body. Are we going with these quibbles over parliamentary usage and points on rules of order to do, as the distinguished Deputy from Wisconsin (Dr. Adams) said, choke this Church and not allow it to grow? She wants to grow. She is endeavoring to spread out her arms and strengthen herself, if we only let her grow. Now, if we are in favor of the amendment which is offered, the choking process will be much greater than if we let the article remain as it is. I know the need we have in our large Dioceses, where the Bishops spend so much time in travelling; I know the need of circumscribing the geographical limits of those Dioceses, in order that they may visit them more thoroughly. To give an example, I live in West Tennessee; there are about twenty counties in that portion of the State. Out of those twenty there are at least twelve in which no Minister of this Church ever lifts his voice. We believe that it is our right to extend the Church. We believe that it is our duty to go out and preach the Gospel in the highways and byways, and yet here are people who never hear the voice of the Church. Shall they hear it? Can we Presbyters, confined to the small area of parishes, go out and occupy these large fields which are unoccupied, and in which the voice of the minister of the Church is never heard? We all know we cannot. Who is to be the chief missionary if not the Bishop? If you put him in a Diocese that is over four hundred miles long, it is all that he can

do to visit the parishes and missionary stations that are already formed; and how then is this ground to be occupied? But if the geographical limits are made less, then the Bishop might take these twenty counties, and reviewing the ground, see what the openings are, and prepare to establish work in the various counties. But now it is necessary that he should wait till, by some means or other, you can get ten or twelve parishes already established in these large territorial districts, and thus the growth of the Church is put off.

How was it in the time of the Apostles? St. Paul could say, although he had to go much of the distance on foot, "from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ," yet we can point to whole districts which are of smaller dimensions than the one spoken of by St. Paul, in which this Church does not raise her voice, and in which I venture to say, if the provisions here proposed are insisted upon, she will not, for years to come, be able to raise her voice.

President and brethren of this Convention, do let us give the Church a chance to grow. Do let us believe that a Bishop is not necessarily compelled to have more of a salary than a Presbyter. He can live on as little as a Presbyter can. He is as willing to endure hardships, and go out to the front. He is the only one that can go, and go freely, throughout the length and breadth of the district. The parochial clergy are necessarily more or less confined to their various parochial organizations.

I do hope that none of these restrictions will be kept in this article of the Constitution. If there is any restriction that is allowable at all, it is that of territorial limit, and not the number of parishes and of ministers that may be in the district.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, it strikes me that if we thoroughly understood each other, we might come to a vote without very long or very serious debate. I therefore shall speak but a very words, merely to express what we mean who desire no change in the present number. At the East, and in the North, it is an easy matter to divide Dioceses as the Constitution now stands, and so obtain at any moment increased Episcopal service and supervision; but take for example the Western Diocese of Kentucky. Will you there find seven self-supporting parishes all through it? I doubt it. Take the Diocese of Alabama in the South. Have we there seven thoroughly self-supporting parishes all through? If we have I will tell you how we have them. We have them because we have men doing something like this: living on \$150 a year and borrowing that.

Sir, I mean business in this matter. Alabama is an organized Diocese. Alabama cannot divide now under the provision that you have, and yet it is my opinion, and it is the opinion of my beloved Bishop, that nothing in the world would so help the cause of the Church as an increase of the leadership of the Episcopate. But, sir, go farther South and go farther West. What is the principle of this Church which it has solemnly adopted? It is that the Episcopate shall go forward with the flag, and that the Episcopate, bearing all things, enduring all things, hoping all things, shall carry on that flag with the rallying cry, "Come on!"—not with the pusillanimous cry, "I have \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year; now, you go on with nothing!"

I do trust that our brethren of the North and our brethren of the East will not do what my beloved brother from Wisconsin has said: choke the Church West and East with red-tape. You have put it down now to six parishes and six Presbyters. That is enough to give the Bishop his little corporal's

guard to go on with ; but do not make it any harder, unless you want to stop the march of the Church. Do not make it any more severe. And, as to this money consideration, although I will not speak of it now, I would only say, do not let the weight of a dollar tell in the scales of the Church.

I said I should be brief, because I trust it will not be a matter of very much more debate. I am willing to come to a vote at once on the question of an increase of the number beyond six, and decidedly to vote "no" upon that proposition, and I ask my brethren of the North and of the East not to vote against us. You are easy ; we are pressed.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I will venture to suggest, in order that members of the House may vote intelligently, that this General Convention by legislation already has made provision on this matter by allowing missionary jurisdictions to be cut off from Dioceses which are too large, and that a missionary jurisdiction can be created which does not contain a sufficient number of clergymen, or a number sufficiently trustworthy and discreet to be allowed to elect their own Bishop. I have no doubt that is one reason for the reluctance of opening the door for an increase of the Episcopate in this way. There has been, on the part of the Bishops especially, a reluctance that it should be confided to so small a number as six clergymen, most of whom may be young men, to be charged with the weighty duty of electing a Bishop. Is it not best that during the early years and infancy of the work that part of the country should exist as a Missionary jurisdiction rather than that a few young men, or a few laymen, uneducated in the Church, should be charged with so weighty a matter ?

May it not be wise, then, to leave the matter as it stands, admitting the amendment offered by my lay colleague ? That is to say, is it imperatively necessary that this division of the country shall have Episcopal supervision ? Application can be made to the Convention, and it can be set off into a missionary jurisdiction until such time as it attains the number of ten clergymen and ten parishes. Surely if there is any prospect of growth in that region, it will not take more than one or two years before it reaches that point, and then perhaps we may think, and not till then, that we are willing to trust so small a number to do such an important act as to elect a Bishop.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I am very glad that the reverend brother who preceded me sustained the point that he put, but I want to call his special attention to the fact that we have an amendment of the Constitution on its passage providing for missionary jurisdictions, and whenever a Diocese is too large for the proper administration of it by the Bishop, there will be this provision for a missionary jurisdiction. That seems to me to answer very largely the wants that have been so feelingly urged.

Now I want to offer one argument that I think will appeal to us all. I am perfectly convinced myself that this amendment to the Constitution can only pass the House of Bishops by going almost unanimously through this Body, and that the Bishops will not accept it without this provision for ten Presbyters and ten parishes. The Fathers of the Church have felt very strongly upon this point against any diminution of the restraints, upon the division of Dioceses, and that feeling, of course, was very largely the feeling of the House of Bishops in altering the Constitution and taking out of it the fifteen Presbyters and parishes. This was put in as a kind of compromise, and the expression then of the House of Bishops was very decided. I think it will be repeated now ; and if this amendment of the Constitution be not carried in this

House unanimously, the House of Bishops will non-concur. Therefore we are wasting time, in my judgment. I may be a false prophet, however, in that matter. Let us agree on the amendment, and I think we had better have it "ten" Presbyters and churches in order to obtain the consent of the House of Bishops. In the meantime, we can, under the other provision of the Constitution, meet the wants of the Church until such time as the Diocese shall have ten self-supporting parishes and Presbyters.

I think, myself, that there is a feeling with some of us that may be a little bit enthusiastic in the matter. It comes to my mind that there are two constitutions in the Church, one of them given to us by the mother, our Holy Church, and the other by our blessed Lord, and that the two ought to be made somehow or other to agree. I do not think that the article of the Constitution in question would read now exactly in harmony with the original constitution as given by the Apostle St. Matthew. It seems to me, when our Lord said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," it does not sound exactly right to say, Go, provided there be a sufficient provision to support you ! If we come to a little more harmony, we may induce the House of Bishops to accept this change, but I am convinced we must give them the opportunity of a graceful acceptance by putting in "ten." I wish the question might be taken, and that we could come to an end of this debate.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany. I wish to ask the mover of the amendment a question. Will he agree to accept an amendment to his amendment naming "eight" ?

Mr. ATWATER, of Minnesota. No, sir.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Atwater to strike out "six" and substitute "ten," and that vote is to be taken by a vote by Dioceses and orders, I understand.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I withdraw, on the part of the Diocese of Alabama, the call for a vote by orders.

The PRESIDENT. The call is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment.

The Chair put the question on the amendment, and declared that the ayes appeared to prevail.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. I must insist that, on a proposed amendment to an article of the Constitution, the vote shall be taken by Dioceses and orders.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. We do not have to take the vote by Dioceses and orders at every point. After all the amendments are in, then we take the vote in that way on the whole proposition.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. We can then accept or reject the whole. Now, sir, if I may be permitted—

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. The President announced the vote. I rise to a point of order, whether a gentleman can raise a question after the vote has been taken.

The PRESIDENT. The vote was taken and the amendment was carried by apparently a large majority. Dr. Mead has a matter to present.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. By permission of the House, I wish to call attention to one fact, that in 1835 we had no constitutional provision fixing the number. In 1835 the first Canon passed was a Canon "Of the Election of Bishops," which I will read:

"Sec. 1. Any Diocese in union with this Church, having, at the time, less than six officiating Presbyters residing therein, regularly settled in a parish or church, and qualified to vote for a Bishop, and any Diocese, at the time of its organization, with a view to ask for admission into union with this Church, may, by a vote of the Convention thereof"—

Mind, you have "less than six."

—"request the General Convention to elect a Bishop for the same; and thereupon the House of Bishops may nominate to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, for their concurrence, a suitable person for the office of Bishop; who shall, in case of their concurrence, be consecrated as the Bishop of such Diocese," etc.

Now, mark the actual number there.

"Sec. 2. In the recess of the General Convention, the Church in any such Diocese may, by a vote of the convention thereof, request the election of a Bishop for such Diocese by the Bishops of the Church; and when such request shall be made known to the Presiding Bishop, who shall communicate information of the same to the other Bishops, a majority of the Bishops may select a suitable person for such Bishop; and if a majority of the Standing Committees of the churches in the different Dioceses shall consent to the consecration of the person so selected, the Presiding Bishop, with any two Bishops, or any three Bishops, to whom he may communicate the testimonials, may proceed to the consecration."

Now, gentlemen, let me tell you that there was action in 1836 under this Canon, and but for that action and this Canon, at that time, a Diocese in the West, which is now a glory in the land, the Diocese of Michigan, could not have had a Bishop. She had less than six clergymen. The Convention of the Diocese urged the Bishops under this Canon to give them a Bishop, and Bishop White went to work and endeavored first to get the Bishops together, and when he could not do that he collected the suffrages by letter and elected the present Bishop of Michigan. You see at that period of the Church it was all-important. That Diocese is now here asking for a division. What would have been the condition of Michigan if it had not been for this liberality? I say with my brother from Wisconsin—do not, I entreat you, with red-tape choke the progress of the Church. Let well enough alone. It was introduced as a constitutional provision after this action by Canon in 1835, and put in by the Church at that time that there should be six Presbyters and six churches. Let it stand there.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is upon the report of the Committee as it has been amended on motion of Mr. Atwater, striking out "six" and substituting "ten" in the following paragraph of this article of the Constitution.

The Chair put the question on the resolutions as amended, and declared that the ayes prevailed.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I understand that this goes up to the House of Bishops. I would wish, therefore, that the House of Bishops should know by what majority we have passed it, and how great our feeling is, and how complete our consent is in reference to this matter. I therefore call for a division, that the ayes and noes on this question may be understood by the House of Bishops.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I desire to say that there has been a notable misapprehension in the rear of this House of what has been going on immediately around the Chair. It was announced by the reverend gentleman from Connecticut that a vote by orders would have to be taken upon this question, and under that impression the call for a vote by orders was not made formally, as would have been done by Dioceses on this floor. I really do think that on a matter of so much importance the House should be permitted to express its deliberate sentiment. I move, therefore, if it is necessary, to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was agreed to, it having been put without anybody knowing in our portion of the House what was going on, and we were counted as voting for it, although we might have been in sentiment against

it. I submit whether, on so grave and important a matter, we ought not at least to have the opportunity of being able to understand the question that is put to the House?

The PRESIDENT. I will read Article 9 of the Constitution, and it can be determined by the House, or rather custom will determine, whether the vote must be taken by Dioceses and orders. I think it has been usual to do so. Article 9 says:

"This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention, by the Church, in a majority of the Dioceses which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several Diocesan Conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to, or ratified, in the ensuing General Convention."

My own idea is that the requisition of a majority of the Dioceses refers both to the proposal and to the final ratification.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I would state that the Rev. Dr. Hawks, in his consideration of this very article, lays down four propositions, and, I think, proves them. The first is, that in all questions of constitutional or liturgical changes the vote must be by Dioceses and orders.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair has decided to that effect, and the vote will be taken in that way.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I conceive that there is a doubt about this matter. The final vote of the next Convention must be by orders, but it has not been the custom heretofore to have the vote on the mere proposition by orders. I refer to the Journal of 1871, page 201. I do not think it is necessary to take the vote by orders, unless it is called for.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I call for the reading of the proposition as it now stands.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the fifth article of the Constitution be amended by striking out the following words: 'And such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the Episcopate in the contemplated new Diocese,' and that the word 'six' be stricken out in the second line after the words proposed to be stricken out by the Committee, wherever it occurs, and the word 'ten' substituted in place thereof.

"Resolved, That such amendment be ratified and notified to the several Diocesan Conventions in accordance with the ninth article of the Constitution, so that the same may be agreed to or ratified by the next General Convention."

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, with the following result:

CLERICAL VOTE.—Dioceses voting, 41: ayes 33, noes 5, divided 3.

LAY VOTE.—Dioceses voting, 35: ayes 31, noes 3.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution as amended, proposing to amend Article 5 of the Constitution, is adopted.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

A message (No. 70) from the House of Bishops, announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the matter of preparing an account of the design, history, and Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in compliance with a request of the Executive Committee of the Centennial Commission for an International Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, to be deposited in one of the departments of the Exhibition, be referred to the Rev. Wm. Stevens Perry, D.D., His

toriographer of the Church, with the request that he prepare such an account as is desired by the Executive Committee of the Centennial Commission."

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that the House concur in that resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The time has arrived for the recess, and the House accordingly takes a recess until two o'clock.

TRUSTEES OF RELIEF FUND.

A Message (No. 71) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had appointed as members of the Joint Committee to nominate Trustees of the Fund for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Clergymen and of Aged and Infirm Clergymen, in accordance with the requirement of the act incorporating said Trustees, the Bishops of New York, of Long Island, and of Maine.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. I move that we concur in that action of the House of Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Committee on the part of this House, Rev. Dr. Shelton, of Western New York, Mr. Livingston, of New York, and Mr. Meigs, of New Jersey.

FRENCH PRAYER-BOOK.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Mr. Edward R. Perkins, of Massachusetts, be added to the Joint Committee on the translation of the French Prayer-Book; and that said Joint Committee be continued until the next session of the General Convention.

CHURCHES ABROAD.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 36 from the House of Bishops, proposing certain amendments to Canon 5, Title III., 'Of Congregations and Parishes,' respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the House of Deputies concur therein, as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in the substitution of two new clauses for Clause [11] of Section 3, of Canon 5, of Title III., relating to the organization of churches in Foreign lands, and proposed to this House in Message No. 36."

The resolution was agreed to.

CHURCH MUSIC.

Rev. Dr. BENEDICT, of Georgia, from the Committee on Canons, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 23 from the House of Bishops, proposing the adoption of a Canon 'Of Church Music,' respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the concurrence of the House of Deputies therein, with amendments, as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in the adoption of the Canon transmitted to this House in Message No. 23, and entitled 'Of Church Music,' with the following amendments:

"1st. To prefix an additional clause, as follows:

"(1.) The selection of the psalms in metre and the hymns which are set forth by authority, are allowed to be sung in all congregations of this Church before and after Morning and Evening Services, and also before and after sermons, at the discretion of the minister, whose duty it shall be by standing direc-

tion, or from time to time, to appoint such authorized psalms and hymns as are to be sung.

"2d. To amend the Canon proposed by the House of Bishops, so that it may read as follows:

"(2.) And further, it shall also be the duty of every minister of this Church, with such assistance as he may see fit to employ from persons skilled in music, to give order concerning the tunes to be sung at any time in his church, and especially it shall be his duty to suppress all such music and all such conduct in its performance as are inconsistent with the design and purpose of public worship.

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in their resolution relating to the printing of the Canon 'Of Church Music.'"

The resolutions were adopted.

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask to take from the table that which comes next in order, the report made on the eleventh day by the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, as found on page 75 of THE DAILY CHURCHMAN, on the resolutions of Dr. Burr reducing representation in this House. The resolution at the end is that the Committee be discharged, or something to that effect.

The Secretary read the report as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Burr, of Ohio, as to the expediency of proposing an amendment to the Constitution reducing the number of Clerical and Lay Deputies from each Diocese, and the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of Connecticut, as to the expediency of rearranging the same on a new basis of representation, respectfully report that such amendments, in their opinion, would be inexpedient at the present time, and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

Rev. Dr. BURR, of Ohio. I was induced to offer the resolution which gave rise to this report, for a reason which must be very obvious to every member of this House. I am very sorry that the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution have not regarded it in the same light as I think a large number of the members of the Convention do. This House has been growing with the number of dioceses, until it has become too large to do the business of the Church with promptness and with safety, in my humble judgment. I think I have seen during this session the evils resulting from having so large a number as at present constitutes this House of the Convention. I have been a member of the Convention for a good many years. The time was when the business of this Convention was despatched with rapidity, at least as much rapidity as was consistent with the safety of the business of the Church; and I think it must be obvious to every man in this House that this body is too large, and that the business has been accumulating in about the same proportion that the dioceses of the Church have increased.

Now, look forward to the fact that this amendment to the Constitution cannot be availed of before six years; that it must go to each Diocese and receive sanction there, and after it shall be sanctioned by the Dioceses, the next General Convention will have to act upon it, and that we shall have not only the number of Dioceses we have now, but ten or twelve added in the mean time. At any rate, look forward six years, until which time the amendment I propose cannot go into operation, and what will be the condition of things with twenty-five more Dioceses? This body would then, with the present number of Deputies from each Diocese, be composed of about 600 members? Does any one suppose that the busi-

ness of the Church could be conducted with anything like speed or facility with that number of members in our House? It must be evident to every member of this House that we have too many now for business purposes.

Again, what is the necessity that each Diocese should be represented by eight Deputies, four clerical and four lay? My proposition, perhaps, was not expressed most felicitously, but I proposed to reduce the number one-half. But suppose there were six from each Diocese, three of each order; I would be perfectly willing to agree to that. I hope that the report of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution will not be concurred in. It must seem clear to the mind of every member, I think, that expediency requires a change. I know of no principle whatever that stands in the way. The Constitution does not admit of more than four of each order from each Diocese; it does not say how many under that number shall be sent, but it was supposed that it was necessary that the Constitution should be amended before the measure proposed could go into effect. Therefore my resolution went to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. I would be glad if this report were recommitted to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, with instructions to report in accordance with the view I have presented.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I may say, in view of my record in this body, that it would be very inconsistent on my part if I were to acquiesce in the passage of the report just presented. I was in the minority in the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. All the rest of the members, I believe, without exception, differed from myself on this question. I still maintain and assert the opinion which I have asserted in this body at three successive Conventions before, that our members ought to be reduced at once, and that there is no possibility of relieving this House of the pressure upon it, without an immediate reduction as soon as it can be made. I say it ought to be reduced not to four members from each Diocese, but to six. Eight from each Diocese now makes three hundred and twenty. We are bringing in six new Dioceses, which will add forty-eight more seats to be provided for at the next session; and before this amendment can take effect, we shall have nearly one hundred new seats to provide for, and the crowd will come upon us so fast that I think we are bound to take the matter in time, and now apply the remedy.

That was my proposition, and I urged it before the Committee, but in vain. They held to the contrary that it was valuable to have a large Convention where great bodies of our fellow-countrymen might come together once in three years, and the larger the Convention the better for purposes of fraternity and union. I was voted down all hollow, as I was before; but I still maintain that the only possible mode in which the plethora of this body can be relieved is by blood-letting. Lop off two out of every eight, and with that we can get along possibly for twenty-five years, and then we shall have to take off two more, and so gradually until the Dioceses will send but one clergyman and one of the laity apiece; and when the last extremity comes in the future we may be obliged to divide the House into two bodies, one clerical and one lay, in order to relieve the pressure. I cannot tell what the enormous increase of our Dioceses may bring upon us; but this will relieve us for one generation to come. I therefore entirely approve of the motion of my friend from Ohio to recommit with instructions.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I beg leave to move an amendment to the Constitution on this

point. I am looking forward to the ultimate General Council of this Church in which the representation shall be one Bishop, one clergyman, and one layman from each Diocese composing this House, and I say also that at this present time it is perfectly manifest that we have too many. Still at the same time, as a measure of justice, I think we should be progressive. I think that instead of cutting off the members at once to what will be the future numbers, we should distinctly take off twenty-five per cent. I know the West, and I tell the clergy and laity of this House that in six years we shall have between ten and twenty new Dioceses, and then our House of Convention, instead of being a deliberative body, will be simply a mere mob—a mob, to be sure, of gentlemen and Christians, but not the less tumultuous, and not the less excitable, and not the less unmanageable in doing the business which we come here to do. I therefore, instead of the resolution which the highly respectable Committee on Amendments to the Constitution have introduced, move this amendment:

"That in the second article of the Constitution in the fourth line the word 'three' be substituted for 'four' in the two places where it occurs."

I think, having made that motion, you cannot accuse me of verbosity or too much talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I think it is too late in the session to discuss this question. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman be willing to let it go over to the next Convention?

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Laying it on the table will take it over.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion was not agreed to, there being on a division, ayes, 60; noes, 91.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I should like to move as a test-question to strike out "four" and insert "two."

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I move to recommit the report, with instructions to report that the representation of each Diocese be three of each order.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention: I wish to explain the reason why I voted against laying this measure on the table. It was because I think there is a view of the matter which has not yet been perhaps sufficiently considered by this Convention. Many of us came to this Convention with the earnest hope, with the strong desire, that some wise plan might be laid before this body for the creation of a provincial system in this Church which would meet with the necessities of the day as we stand in a country like this of such vast extent, where there are such differences of opinion, of sentiment, and of situation in all respects. In that, for many causes for which no one is responsible, we have been disappointed. I should be sorry that, while this General Convention remains the only Provincial Synod of this Church, the number of its members should be decreased. I think if we should now cut down the number of a Diocese's Deputies from four to three of each order, a few General Conventions hence that precedent would be followed, and then we should have two of each order, and at length one of each order, until this would be brought into the position of an oligarchical institution, attempting to perform functions over the length and breadth of the United States, and wherever our Foreign Missions extend, to which really nobody in the world ever was or will be competent. I trust that this movement may not prevail, for the simple reason that I think it would be the

surest way in the world to prevent the possibility of our having a provincial system established. When the provincial system is established, as necessity demands, I think, already, and as I think our experience is beginning to prove to be necessary, then let the greater body which meets at any intervals at all that may then seem to be wisest be a smaller body; let it be more representative of the highest intellect chosen from the chosen, if you will; but in the mean time let us not cut away the representation of this Church in such a fashion or in such a manner as to prevent the best possible distribution of the Church into provinces.

I hope that the measure may not prevail; not because I am opposed to it, but because I think it will prevent another thing that is more immediately and more pressingly necessary, and which would be put practically out of sight by this measure. There is no time in the history of the world, there never was a time, when any such continent as this was represented in one Provincial Synod.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I rise to a question of order. We have a report lying on the table on the provincial system, and it ought not to be discussed at the present time. Let that be discussed on its merits. We shall show that no provincial system is necessary when that report comes up, and that it would strike at the best interests of this Church.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. My friend says there is a report now on the table of this House in which it is set forth to this Convention that no provincial system is necessary; that it would strike at the best interests of this Church. I am sorry to hear that such a report is on our table; I am amazed to hear that such a report is on this table; and I trust that when that discussion comes up it may be considered in connection with this matter. If we are never to have a provincial system, then let us, by all means, reduce the number of this House, and if we are to have a provincial system, let us not reduce its number at present.

I am not going to make any more of a speech. I have done. I trust this matter will be postponed until the report on the provincial system comes up.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I second the motion to have them both considered together. I want them discussed at the same time.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I think it must be evident to this whole House that the body itself is unwieldy, it is too large to work well. It is not a place for wise and calm deliberation. Some two or three hundred members in this House have been forced to absolute silence, and I might say to absolute deafness in this House. They have neither spoken, nor have they heard what was spoken, the House has been so tumultuous and so disorderly from about the first day of this session until this moment. I do not think it is a place for work. I do not think the number of three hundred and twenty members here now promote wise deliberation. In six years more we shall probably have six hundred members. I think myself that two delegates of each Order from each Diocese are sufficient. I would prefer that number; but I am willing to yield to the suggestion of the wise old Presbyterian from Ohio to reduce it gradually, as it seems to be approved by the reverend representative from Wisconsin, and by the learned lawyer from New York, that a fair reduction is from four to three of each Order. I do not think this question ought to be complicated at all with the question of provincial Synods or provincial anything; but I would say for myself that if I thought the reduction from eight to six in this House would tend to defeat the provincial system, I would sustain it still more strongly than I do now.

Mr. LAMBERTON, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there is one thought that is well worthy of consideration in connection with the proposition now before the House; and that is that by the reduction of the number from four to three, if all the Deputies vote, we can have no divided vote of a Diocese, so that when two of a delegation, either clerical or lay, cast their vote, it cannot be nullified by the single remaining Deputy. The amendment accomplishes this, besides the reduction of the large number that will necessarily constitute the House by the increase of the number of Dioceses.

Rev. Dr. MEAD, of Connecticut. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have now forty-one Dioceses, and the next General Convention three years hence will embrace forty-five. Multiplying forty-five by eight will give us three hundred and sixty members, as we shall certainly be then. I do think that one of the most important measures of this Convention will be to start on its progress an amendment to the Constitution to reduce the number from each Diocese represented in this House. I am in favor of two; for I do not think there is any great force in the argument of the gentleman who last spoke, that because there are three the vote cannot be divided. I hope the votes may never be divided. I wish each Diocese to vote distinctly; but if there be three, two of course will be a majority.

I tell you, gentlemen, it is highly important that you set the thing in motion at this Convention; and although I had hoped and wished that we might adjourn to-night, I am ready to stay another week or two if we can get this. If you delay the initiative of it in this Convention, you will leave us at the end of six years with four or five hundred, probably five hundred Deputies in this House, and the difficulty will increase with each recurring Convention. As we increase the number our difficulties multiply, for it must be said that clergyman and layman, even ecclesiastically, are not free from petty ambition—the ambition to attend a General Convention. I hope, however, that that ambition may be laid so far from them that they will all remember that the interests of the Church are to be the first thing in the view of every Churchman, and those interests decidedly call for a reduction of the number who are authorized now to attend this House. If you do not begin the work now, you cannot accomplish it under six years.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. Mr. President, as one of the Committee who made this report, I believe the time may come when you will have a reduction; but when you begin to reduce this House, I conceive that you begin to destroy this Convention, and you begin to destroy this Church. Gentlemen may not see it in the light I do; but if you now reduce this House to two laymen and two clergymen from each Diocese, the very reason on which this is proposed will carry to one layman and one clergyman, and your House of Bishops, constituting a separate House, will be double the number it now is. You can concentrate more wisdom in four hundred men than in two hundred. Although you may have more folly, still you have more wisdom.

Gentlemen say we are tumultuous. What has made us tumultuous? I say we have been tumultuous because we cannot hear. It is the place in which you have been assembled which has operated to cause tumult; nothing else. Men cannot attend when, by all their exertions, they cannot hear. That has been our position here. If every man when he came here would have spoken naturally as he speaks at home, he would have given what he had to say without rhetoric, perhaps; he

would not have preached; he would not have sought to beat the air; but actually coming here to this rostrum, where I now stand, he is enticed to do it because he has to elevate his voice so high. Give us a place of assembly where we can hear each other, and I venture to say all these difficulties will disappear. You never can be orderly in any assembly where you cannot hear. That has been the great difficulty at the present time.

You say that four hundred is too large a body. Well, how large is the House of Commons? They have managed to get along for a great many years with over six hundred members, nearly double your number now, and they have managed a great nation. Do you tell me that you gentlemen, Christian gentlemen, who come here, cannot be otherwise than tumultuous? I do not believe it. I will not concede it. If you can hear, you will attend. You may depend we shall find more wisdom in four hundred men here than in two hundred. But at all events, what I say is, if you diminish the number now because you cannot stand four, you must diminish it at the next session to three; and because you cannot stand that you will come to two, and you will go on, and once you break this body to only two representatives from each Diocese, I tell you you have lost almost your whole value on the Dioceses of this Church. You may not agree with me in my views, but I think I have as much experience as almost anybody here, and I do not think that I am very far wrong in telling you that if you diminish your numbers so much, you will carry less sympathy home. You will gather less sympathy here, and therefore you will carry less home. We have all agreed that it is the sympathy which this body creates among those who are assembled from such distant parts of our country, and which they carry back, that encourages the heart of the Church. Diminish the streams by which that is carried out, and you will very soon diminish the supply.

I must confess that I am also desirous that the provincial system should be adopted, because I believe that if you knit provinces together, and they are concentrated in a body that shall not meet so often as this, you will have then something which will always unite the whole, and there will be a continual stream of sympathy and good feeling going through the whole. I stand alone on the subject of provinces in the Committee of which I am a member; but I believe you cannot help it; you cannot resist it. If you are driven to diminish your numbers, you ought to be driven to your provincial system.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. It seems to me, sir, that this is a very simple matter, and therefore, of course, I only wish to say two or three words about it.

I can readily understand that the question of change in the administration of the Church from the present system to that of the provincial systems might naturally come under consideration when this subject is being debated from the present standpoint; but I do not think it ought to affect the action of this House on this question, for this reason: The matter of Provinces will, in course of time, be settled by the geographical necessities of this country. It is a foregone conclusion that we must have the provincial system in America some of these days. A great many persons who advocated the provincial system as a theory urged it upon the Church some time ago; and the possibility at least of debating the question and putting it in a tentative form was accomplished; but even in those Dioceses which were the best prepared for the provincial system there has never been an assembling,

if I am not mistaken, of so-called Deputies to the provincial synod.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Only one.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Once. "The sober second thought" of the Church has certainly decided the question that the Church is not yet prepared for the provincial system, although we all feel that it will come whenever the Church in this country is so organized throughout its whole area in Dioceses, and it can then be done satisfactorily to all concerned; and I am quite prepared to say that I am myself entirely ready to give my vote and support to that organization, if it should come in my day, whenever the time is ripe. But, meantime, this question comes up in reference to what may be called the popular branch of the legislature of the Church. Our body by the multiplication of Dioceses is becoming very large, and I think it will be admitted by all who have indulged in any observation upon the conduct of legislative assemblies that all very large bodies are, of necessity, turbulent bodies. The necessity of making one's self heard, as has already been spoken, aside from any other consideration, gives a certain character of turbulence to the body. It is a matter of the greatest importance that a religious body assembled for the purpose of legislating for the interests of Christ's Church should not be chargeable with any such element of maladministration. We ought to have the utmost decorum and solemnity in all of our deliberations; and I appeal to the religious sensibility of every member of this body if he has not been shocked more than once by scenes in this assembly when in the midst of tumult resort has been had to parliamentary tactics for the sake of defeating or carrying a measure which could not be fairly comprehended by the body and which was sought to be rushed through in one direction or the other by the mere tricks of legislation. From all this, as has been before said in this body, as applied to another matter, "good Lord, deliver us."

We ought to be free from any such characterization as this implies, and we can only be free from it by keeping this body within limited numbers. In my humble judgment, it is already too large. I am not in favor of reducing the number by one-half, for I think that is too great a jump at once; but I am strongly in favor of the reduction by one from the clerical and one from the lay deputation of every Diocese, which, bear in mind, cannot take effect under six years, during which time there will be probably twenty new Dioceses represented, and before we can fairly have the benefit of this change of the Constitution we shall find ourselves so large a body as to be quite unmanageable; and I hope—I would remark here incidentally—that while we are so large a body, the gentlemen to whose wisdom the matter of preparing rules for the next General Convention shall be committed will take into consideration the matter of restoring the previous question, so that we can have that most valuable, as I think in all legislative assemblies, of all rules, which has here been characterized, I think, very unfairly as a gag rule, but which has another alternative operating in this body to precisely the same effect, to wit: laying on the table, except to the disadvantage that we have no opportunity under that rule of resorting to and acting upon the main question.

I only indicate this as a part of what we shall be compelled to do in consideration of the largeness of our numbers. If, in the course of six, twelve or fifteen years, we find it is important for us to have the provincial system established in this country, we can, with very great facility, restore to the different Dioceses a

larger representation here, if it be thought desirable, and in anticipation of such action which is said to require six years, we could have concurrently this other action restoring to the Dioceses the same representation to go into effect at the time the provincial system went into effect. So I do not see the force of that argument.

This is a matter for our present convenience, for preserving dignity, for securing prompt, intelligent consideration of the business brought before us, and for accomplishing the purpose of our assembling directly and quickly, instead of circuitously and very slowly.

I commend the measure, therefore, to the consideration of this House without indulging in some other allusions in which the distinguished Deputy from South Carolina has anticipated me, and which I think were very well. Our debates, when we are a large body, are entirely different in tone and temper from that which they ought to have, which they have had in days that are passed, and which they will again have if this body is reduced in its membership by twenty-five per cent.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. May I be allowed to make the motion, on the understanding that if it passes three is recommended, that the report be recommitted. If it be recommitted, we understand that we are to report three. I make the motion in order to get an end of the question.

The PRESIDENT. That is the motion already.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move simply that the report be recommitted.

The PRESIDENT. Without instructions?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Understanding that the recommitment is an instruction.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The gentleman says the vote to recommit, if carried, will be understood by the Committee as instructions to report three. With that understanding we may safely vote.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I hope it will be understood that if we vote not to recommit we shall then vote at once to concur in the report of the Committee.

Mr. McCRAIDY, of South Carolina. If we take the vote now and vote down the proposition, that is an end of it. If we recommit, it will come back and be just as debatable then as it is now.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. That is true; I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to recommit is withdrawn.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I should like to have an opportunity of saying something more on this point. I have a reason which I think will open the minds of this Convention to something more important. We have before us a proposal, and have had for years, of what is called the provincial system. That provincial system, in its plans, is a means for destroying this General Convention. It is a means to compel us to commit suicide. It is a means whereby we shall meet only once in ten years, and then, being perfectly unacquainted one with another, we shall go home, having done nothing. It is a means of breaking this Church up into four, five, or seven great accumulations of States, each of which is to be called a province.

Now, sir, to this proposal of a provincial system, so called, I am opposed. It is proposed that each of the Confederate provinces shall have the same power that the General Convention has; that is to say, equal with us. I believe that this so-called General Convention, which gentlemen have called the great Provincial Council of the Church, but which I call the great National Council of the Church, is one of the greatest means of maintaining catholic union, pureness of living, and vanity of doctrine, and I wish it not destroyed by any means in the

world. I want the State council of all the Dioceses within the State, and this great national council, to remain just as they are. That is my doctrine.

Now, I want to complain a little with regard to my distinguished friend, Dr. Fulton. I have a good temper, and I hope I do not get angry, but it did make me feel bad to see the reverend doctor get up here and propose in his speech, which was, like all the speeches he makes, a very good speech, that this institution of a national council could be permitted to grow so big, so unwieldy, that finally it would spread out so that it should become so enlarged and unmanageable that the provincial system, in order to avoid the difficulties, would be absolutely possible. I say that it is hard to hear that on the floor of this House, and yet at the same time that was solely and exclusively the warp of the woof of his speech.

I have told you before, and I will tell you now, that there is an ultimate shape in which this great national council of the Church shall come, in which it must come, and that is the mode of the Primitive Church, in which one Bishop, one clergyman, and one layman were the representatives of each Diocese in the Church. Members of the Convention must look upon the fact as I do, that this is a Church of the whole nation, and I say, if in every city there shall be a Bishop and the Dioceses shall be six hundred, if you please, I am perfectly content that that modus of representation should prevail. I fully and entirely agree with my distinguished friend, the Lay Deputy from South Carolina, that to a council of six hundred and fifty-eight there is no objection, and I can tell this great council of the Church that I know, and every man who knows Church history knows, that there have been councils of one thousand. I have no objection to numbers, therefore I do not desire to reduce the members in any way; but I see the time coming when in the State of New York there will be from sixteen to twenty Dioceses, and when in the State of Illinois there will be from ten to twenty. Look forward to that time, and you will see that, if we reduce gradually the proportion, we shall not reduce the numbers in any way; but at this present time we must look out for the future, we must look out for a time which is rising upon the Church. We must have the eye of statesmen and not of politicians. Therefore I think that perhaps at this present time the reduction of numbers by twenty-five per cent. will be a thing preparing for the future—a thing to which all men will agree, and in which no man will be done injury to in any one way.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that in the discussion of this vast question, the provincial system, which involves the ruin of the Church, should be presented now. My learned friend from Long Island says it is a foregone conclusion that we are to have a provincial system. I deny the fact, unless it is a foregone conclusion, at the same time, that we are to dissolve the American Union, for the division of this Church into provinces is the same thing as the division of the American political Union into seven separate nations. That is proved by a report lying on your table now, which I could have wished might have been taken up deliberately, and examined proposition by proposition, to draw the attention of each member, for it reaches to the irresistible conclusion that the proposition can lead to nothing but disruption, dismemberment and total ruin. I would no more permit the division of the Church in this way than if I were in Congress. I would agree that the Union should be dissolved, for both measures would involve ruin, and I say the ruin of this Church would be a greater

calamity to mankind than the ruin of the Union itself. In the future consequences it is more important that the Church should be preserved united than that the Union should be, great as the calamity of a dissevered Union would be.

We are therefore on a most important question, and we ought to have time to discuss it. A report lies on your table embracing, I think, eleven successive propositions, each one of which received the assent of that Committee with one exception. Each one of those propositions by its weight and gravity requires to be separately disengaged, and of which you cannot inform your minds sufficiently in a discussion like this.

Let me call your attention to another thing: This is a mode of temporarily relieving this body; and it would relieve it for twenty-five years to come, probably, for the Dioceses would not become so numerous but what we could still get along in that time. But it has been proposed to leave the number as it is; not that it is proper, but for the purpose of making this body so unwieldy as to compel us to consent to the provincial system, in which there lurks a hierarchy. I wish gentlemen to attend to what I say. That scheme is a great plan, with Archbishops and Archdeacons and all the gorgeous hierarchies, to be crowned at last in a Patriarchate, which we do not want. That is the object, and the ambitious gentlemen who pursue that object with untiring tenacity throw obstacles in the way, and have for the last two Conventions, of every effort which seeks to apply the true remedy.

I propose to relieve the weight of this body by throwing a quarter of it overboard, and when necessary throwing over another quarter, so that we may not be compelled to adopt a provincial system which would lead to our certain dismemberment and ruin, and we should be repeating the ecclesiastical history of the Old World. The thing is fraught with the most serious consequences, and I stand here, if it was the last act of my life, to implore and beseech you that you will not withhold this relief, but that you will act upon the hope of living at least twenty-five years longer, that we may not do that which would surely end in the dissolution of this Church.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment of the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin reducing the number of the members of this House. I am so much in favor of that principle that I would be quite willing to make this assembly still more a popular one, and I was prepared, had this proposition been recommitted to the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to propose also to them to take into consideration another proposition, namely, that of allowing each Diocese a representation in this body of two clergymen and two laymen, and an additional Clerical Deputy and an additional Lay Deputy to every fifty, seventy-five, or one hundred clergymen, as the Convention might decide.

But while I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin, I do object that this be mingled up with a discussion of the idea of the provincial system. The arguments adduced here are, I think, fallacious, for the term "provincial system," in one man's mind means one thing and in other man's mind it means another thing. In my mind it does not bear that sense which has been given to it by the speaker who last occupied the floor. I hold that the provincial system in the past did not spring Minerva-like from the brain of any one individual. It was not an idea which was conceived in any one's mind, and which the circumstances of the Church were thereafter made to fit. I hold, rather, that it grew up with the necessities

of the Church and was indicated by the wants of the Church; that indeed the Church itself is no fixed framework into which circumstances must be thrust. Rather it is of infinite flexibility. Rather it is capable of adapting itself to the individual in all his wants, to human society in all its conditions.

Therefore, while I am in favor of a certain kind of provincial system, I am not in favor of reviving any mediæval idea, but rather I am in favor of such a provincial system as is indicated by the wants of the Church in the United States, and therefore any act of ours looking in that direction is a mere experiment, and only tentative. It is in order that we may meet something of the wants of the Church that I would have a commission to plan and contrive some means whereby Dioceses may be confederated, for the time is coming, sooner or later, in which some such action as is proposed by my reverend brother will be necessary. This body must be reduced in number; otherwise, before twenty years are over, it will be double the number it is now.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President and gentlemen, I did not want to speak on this subject, but unfortunately the debate has widened down into the question of the provincial system. I did want to have something to say concerning the report which was presented here by the Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, which seemed to me a perfectly reactionary report, and going back in every respect; but the discussion has come up, and so I must say a few words on this very important subject.

I begin by saying that I have not the slightest objection to the amendment proposed by the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin (Dr. Adams), and I shall vote for it, only I must not be understood to vote for it on the ground that it goes against the provincial system. And yet I do not like to say "goes against the provincial system," because there is an ambiguity in this House with regard to those words, some men meaning one thing by the provincial system, and some men meaning another, and arguments are used against the one system which probably would not apply to the other. I think I can bring this properly to the mind of the House by recalling the history of the provincial system, and what has been done in some of the General Conventions heretofore.

The PRESIDENT. Doctor, you disclaim having any objection to the proposition which is before the House, and formally announce your intention to discuss the provincial system on its own merits. Now I hardly think that can be in order.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Certainly, if the Chair tells me it is not in order and I can make my remarks when that report comes up, I shall be glad to do so; but I know the habit here of discussing questions in the wrong order, and when the time comes for discussing them regularly, the whole thing goes by the board, and as I found everybody saying something about the provincial system, I naturally wanted to get in my "say."

The PRESIDENT. But you have disclaimed any objection to the proposition before the House.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. That shows what it is to be too frank. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. Mr. President and gentlemen, as I moved to lay this business on the table, perhaps it will be proper for me to say a few words touching the general question. I had hoped to have avoided this subject, because it is my experience in this House that where a committee representing its sentiments so generally as this Committee does, reports against a measure, it is a waste of time to discuss it. I supposed that that was the sense of the House, and that

I was saving the time of the House when I made the motion to lay it on the table. With that explanation, which I hope will excuse me, I intend to make a few observations upon the general subject.

I think it is always time enough to meet a difficulty when it arises. As my good friend, Mr. Lincoln, used to say, "Do not attempt to cross the river until you get there." I have not experienced that inconvenience which other gentlemen so much complain of with respect to the numbers of this body. It has been one of the most gratifying experiences of my life to have been mingled with this body. I have not seen any turbulence, any disorder, anything calling for cutting down its numbers. On the contrary, I think that if it could be increased a little of the same material, it would be all the better for it. There is a safety in numbers, and debate is useful. My experience and observation of legislative matters is generally that the best service that is done is in defeating legislation very often. That has been my observation, and it has been considerable, as many of you may suppose.

When you have a great body of intelligent men coming together, you are not subject so much to the influence of individual talents and individual powers. A great effect is produced by having a large, respectable, and numerous representation. I believe in numbers. I believe in numbers in Church and State. It is the safety of the State and of the Church.

We have inconveniences here, I know. I have a voice that enables me to speak out of doors to very large crowds, and therefore I can speak easily in this House; but 320 or 400 men is no number to speak to in a house that had any sort of property for speaking in at all. This is the most wretched place that any human being ever tried to articulate in. [Laughter.] and so it has proved to me. In any proper place, where gentlemen could consult at all, your numbers would not be an objection. If you had only fifty men here you would have the same difficulty in such a place as this. I hope, therefore, the House will not be precipitated into a measure of this kind by the inconvenience which we have had here.

Another matter I wish to suggest. We are very full in this Convention, because we have had a great subject which interests people to come here from all quarters of the country, and our delegations have been full; but in less exciting times, perhaps the House would not be so full. If you cut down the numbers, you may reduce the body more than would be convenient.

Altogether, I do not see any pressing necessity for consuming the time of this body at this period of the session in debating the subject, and hence I tried to get rid of it. You see we have the provincial system behind it, and that is to be hitched on, and we are to have that subject brought up, although the gentlemen who are most in favor of that scheme tell us in advance that the time is not ripe for it. I hope somebody will move to lay that on the table when it comes up, and let us do the practical, the pressing work of the Church in the last hours which we can possibly sit.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I only want fifteen seconds to ask three questions. It is very often urged against this Church that it is not a Church of the people, that the popular voice has no great effect in it, that the people have no representation in the government of its affairs. My first question is, How will this proposed legislation affect that charge? The next question is, How comes it to pass that men have only come to a knowledge of the unwieldy character of this General Convention, when the idea of a province or provinces has got into their heads? The third question is, If the affairs of great

empires can be taken care of in a decorous, orderly, dignified manner, as in Great Britain, by seven hundred legislators, by a larger number than the French Assembly, by an equal number in Germany, how comes it to pass that four hundred or five hundred or six hundred men in this country must be a riotous, turbulent assembly? These are the three questions.

Mr. BARTHOLOW, of Kansas. I suggest that we have but little time. Our numbers have already thinned out. I move to lay the whole matter on the table.

The PRESIDENT. Is the gentleman aware that that motion was taken half an hour ago and decided in the negative?

Rev. Dr. MINNIGERODE, of Virginia. Mr. President, I have not troubled the Convention heretofore, but I hope I shall be permitted to say a few words on this subject. I am very much in favor of laying this subject on the table; but, inasmuch as the gentleman from Maryland, who made that motion a little while ago, has himself made some remarks on the subject, I think it is fair that some other remarks be heard.

I am in favor of laying it on the table because I think it is a dangerous motion at this time, and I would like to get rid of it. I consider it dangerous for the reason that it militates and strikes at the very Constitution of our body. The Constitution of the General Convention has followed the wise principle which is adopted in the organization of all society—the balance of power. We have the House of Bishops, and then we have the Lower House, consisting of equal numbers of clergy and laity. Reduce that number to its minimum, and we shall have the House of Bishops overriding us more than it can do now. Increase the number of Bishops to six hundred, as my honored and venerable friend from Wisconsin said, and the Church is presbyterianized and the Presbyters of the Church are nowhere. I think that we ought to retain the balance of power. It may be said that three members of each Diocese are sufficient. There are sufficient for numbers I agree, but they prevent a divided vote of Dioceses, and thereby rob the minority of its rights.

Further, say to the Dioceses, "Send only two members of each order," and I would much rather see two members from each order than three, because then the rights of the minority are gone—say each Diocese sends only two members, and you will have pretty much the same representatives from every Diocese all the time, and the whole business of the Convention will be carried on in the old way, and no new ideas, no new measures, can be presented. I think, too, that the minorities in the Dioceses will be better protected in their rights if they have four members, and we thus allow the different Dioceses to send a member of the minority, as we see is done in a great many of the Dioceses represented on this floor.

I further think that at these triennial meetings the Church meets not only for legislation, but the members from the North and the South and the East and the West should become acquainted with each other, and should realize that brotherly feeling which is the very essence of the communion of saints on earth, and join their prayers and join their counsels for the advancement of God's glory and the progress of His Holy Church.

I move that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Now, as everything has to be discussed at such length, I respectfully ask general consent to bring up one report a

little in advance of its order. The next report in order is—

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I enquire whether the other subject has been disposed of.

The PRESIDENT. I thought so. The motion was to lay on the table the whole matter—the resolution from the Committee and the amendment.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. The Chair is mistaken. The motion was merely to lay the amendment on the table. ["No." "No."] I appeal to the gentleman who made the motion.

The PRESIDENT. The whole subject was laid on the table.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I want a ruling of the Chair. I say, and I say upon personal knowledge, that the motion was to lay only the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT. I put the question on laying the whole subject on the table.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I voted for the motion under the impression I have stated. Let us have the vote again, understandingly.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, you stated distinctly before the vote that we were to lay the whole subject on the table.

The PRESIDENT. That is what I heard the motion to be. But a call is made that the vote be taken over again.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I suggest to the Deputy from Central New York that the same result is obtained that he desires. What is the difference between laying the amendment and laying the whole subject of the report of the Committee on the table? That carries the report.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. If you lay the report of the Committee on the table, you do not approve it.

Mr. STEPHENSON, of Kentucky. It certainly coincides with the action of the Committee. No amendment is then proposed. This Convention takes no action to amend the Constitution, and this is the substance of the Committee. We can lay the whole subject on the table, and then if we want a substantive vote on the report of the Committee we can reach it. Knowing that my honorable friend agrees that the report of the Committee should be sustained by the House, he will accomplish that result most certainly by laying the whole subject on the table.

The PRESIDENT. It seems to me we are losing a great deal of valuable time in disputing about nothing.

Mr. COMSTOCK, of Central New York. I acquiesce.

PARTS OF DIOCESES TO BE MISSIONARY DISTRICTS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The report next in order is the alteration of the Prayer-Book, that it cannot be done without constitutional action, which, of course, affects a measure here. There is afterwards a report coming up on the same subject on a different phase of the matter not relating to that one point; but as we probably shall debate that here, and as we are under a kind of compact from what we have done to accomplish one thing certainly, I ask unanimous consent to bring up now the report on the change of Article 5, which was as it were agreed upon in the Committee of Conference between the House of Bishops and this House. We passed those acts by which Texas and California were relieved finally in a Committee of Conference, by a kind of understanding that the Constitution should be amended so as to prevent the difficulty hereafter. This change of the Constitution was passed in the last General Convention, and was the one in which there was a

first report made, that it had failed or fallen to the ground by our not giving the Bishops three days to answer in. The last Convention has agreed to this change of the Constitution, and I presume every man has his mind made up upon it, and I would respectfully ask unanimous consent to bring that up now out of its order. The report was made on the nineteenth day of the session on page 159 of THE DAILY CHURCHMAN. It is merely re-enacting what was done at the last Convention, but requires a vote by orders, which will give us all a chance to rest a little.

The resolution was read as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be recommended and proposed that the following addition be made to Article 5 of the Constitution, to wit: Insert at the end of the article the words, 'The General Convention may, upon the application of the Bishop and Convention of an organized Diocese, setting forth that the territory of the Diocese is too large for due Episcopal supervision by the Bishop of the Diocese, set off a portion of such Diocesan territory, which shall, thereupon, be placed within or constitute a missionary jurisdiction, or a part thereof, as the House of Bishops may determine.'"

The SECRETARY. May I suggest the change of the word "jurisdiction" to "district," in accordance with our present provision?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Very well.

The PRESIDENT. The vote on this amendment to the Constitution must be taken by Dioceses and orders.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I should like to ask a question. I understand that according to the decision just made in initiating a change in the Constitution, a vote by Dioceses is necessary. I would most respectfully suggest that it is not necessary as I read the ninth article. It is only when the change is finally to be ratified.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I call the gentleman to order on this point. The House has decided this very morning that this is the proper way. Therefore this question has been settled.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I am asking the Chair whether it be not that the final ratification is the change on which a vote is to be taken by Dioceses and orders?

The PRESIDENT. The Chair decided the other way this morning, and the House have acted upon that decision. The Clerk will call the roll of the Diocese, and members will answer to their names.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Allow me to ask whether, if there be no objection, the Dioceses cannot be called, and answer by a single vote, instead of calling the names of the several Deputies?

The PRESIDENT. I presume that can be done if there be no objection. The Chair will direct that the vote be taken in that way, no objection being made.

The question being taken, the result was as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE—40 Dioceses represented, all voting in the affirmative.

LAY VOTE—33 Dioceses represented, 32 voting in the affirmative; and one divided.

The PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment to the Constitution is adopted for the present, to be sent down to the Diocesan Conventions.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP.

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Expenses, submitted the following report, which was read:

"The Committee on Expenses, to whom was referred the report of the Special Committee in relation to the Senior and Presiding Bishop, respectfully

report that they have given careful consideration to this matter, which is of great moment.

"It is now proposed, for the first time in the history of the Church, to make an appropriation for the support of the Presiding Bishop. The Committee on Expenses are opposed to such action, which imposes upon this body the duty of providing a retiring pension. Each Diocese is bound to take care of its own Bishop when overtaken by age or infirmity. An appropriation for the expenses of the Presiding Bishop was made for the first time by the last Convention. These expenses are in stationery, postage, and clerk-hire. The travelling and other expenses of the Presiding Bishop are paid by the Diocese for which he acts as consecrator.

"This Convention has passed a resolution, providing for the payment of \$500 for the three years intervening until the meeting of the next General Convention. Your Committee recommend the passage of the following resolution, by which more ample provision for the expenses of the Presiding Bishop will be made, and the payments will be annual.

"Resolved, That the Treasurer of this Convention be authorized to pay the sum of \$250 a year to the Presiding Bishop for expenses incurred in the discharge of his duties, in lieu of the sum of \$500 for three years as provided in a former resolution."

Mr. SHATTUCK, of Massachusetts. I suppose that the House understands the matter which is thus brought before it and the ground of action. I will only mention that it comes before us at a very late period, when really we have spent all our money by previous appropriations, and we shall have to make a new assessment upon the Dioceses to provide for any expenses which are imposed upon us by any subsequent action of this Convention. I merely mention this incidentally; but it is the opinion of the Committee, while the circumstances of this case are acknowledged to be very pressing, that this Convention is not bound to provide retiring pensions for Bishops; and many are of the opinion that the present rule and custom, by which the oldest Bishop is necessarily the Presiding Bishop, is not one which it is for the interest of that House should be continued, and we should be sanctioning and endeavoring to continue it if we enter on this principle. If we begin now to provide a retiring pension we shall have to do it in other cases.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The hour for the order of the day has arrived. It is after four o'clock.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I hope there will be unanimous consent to act on that resolution at once.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I have no objection if it does not lead to discussion.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I am in favor of the resolution reported by this Committee. At the same time I think it due to the Diocese of Kentucky that a brief statement shall be made in connection with this matter.

The PRESIDENT. Then it will have to go over.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. Very well. Then I will simply say that the statement would relieve the Diocese of Kentucky from any suspicion of not having discharged its duty to its Bishop.

The resolution was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOP TO SHANGHAI.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I wish to present a resolution for a recess to-day until half-past seven o'clock, the House to resume its session at that hour.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The order of the

day is called, and this cannot be received. The Committee on Canons meet to-night with the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution cannot be received. The House will be cleared. The order of the day is action on the nomination of the Missionary Bishop to Shanghai, and persons not members will retire from the chapel.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that that order be suspended. I understand that when we get into secret session we shall have no nominee before us to act upon. If that is the case—

Several DEPUTIES. We do not know that.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has no understanding on the subject.

The PRESIDENT. The House will be cleared.

The chapel having been cleared, the House proceeded to consider with closed doors the nomination of a Missionary Bishop to Shanghai.

While the doors were closed a message (No. 72) was received from the House of Bishops announcing the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, The Rev. William Pendleton Orrick having declined the nomination to the Missionary Episcopate of Shanghai and parts adjacent, that this House requests the House of Deputies to return to it the nomination committed to it in Message No. 37 from this House."

The doors were opened at half-past five o'clock, when the vote on the election of Rev. Mr. Orrick as Missionary Bishop of Shanghai and parts adjacent was announced to be as follows:

CLERGY—41 Dioceses voting—Ayes, 40; nay, 1.

LAYTY—32 Dioceses voting—Ayes, 32.

Mr. LAMBERTON, of Central Pennsylvania. I move to now concur in the message of the House of Bishops withdrawing the nomination to the Missionary Episcopate of Shanghai, and parts adjacent.

The PRESIDENT. That is not necessary. The election is the best answer we can give.

Mr. LAMBERTON, of Central Pennsylvania. Very well.

THE NEW HYMNAL.

A message (No. 73) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), 1st. That, instead of the matter printed on the third page of the revised Hymnal, there shall hereafter be printed in all authorized copies of the book the joint resolution in relation to the Hymnal adopted by this Convention.

"2d. That hereafter certificates of accuracy in editions of the Hymnal be issued to publishers of the Trustees of the Fund for the relief of the widows and orphans of deceased clergymen, and of aged, infirm and disabled clergymen, in whom the copyright is vested, and by them only.

"3d. That the matter on the fourth page of the revised Hymnal be printed in all authorized copies as a Canon.

ORDER OF DEACONESSSES.

A message (No. 74) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Canon 'Of Deaconesses or Sisters,' reported by the Joint Committee to this Convention, be referred to a Joint Committee consisting of three Bishops, three Clerical, and three Lay Deputies, to report to the next General Convention.

"And that the House of Bishops names as such Joint Committee on its own part: The Bishop of Alabama;

the Bishop of Long Island; the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania.

The resolution was concurred in.

FORCE OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

A message (No. 75) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That a Special Joint Committee be appointed to enquire and report to the next General Convention as to the force, relative to the legislation and discipline of the Church, of any joint resolution passed by the two Houses.

"And the House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has appointed as such joint committee on the part of this House the Bishops of Central New York, Arkansas, and New Hampshire."

The resolution was concurred in.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE.

On motion of Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts, the report of the Committee on Canons relative to the Baptismal Service was made the order of the day for to-morrow, at eleven o'clock.

On motion, the House adjourned until to-morrow, at nine o'clock A.M.

LETTERS FROM THE EASTERN CHURCH.

The letters which follow were recently received by me from the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Metropolitan of Athens. As will be seen, they are in response to the resolutions of our last General Convention, copies of which I had the honor of transmitting to these eminent ecclesiastics.

CHARLES R. HALE,

Secretary of the Russo-Greek Committee, Rector of St. John's Church, Auburn, New York.
Christmas, 1872.

The resolutions above referred to, adopted at Baltimore, October 24, 1871, are as follows:

"Resolved, That this Convention cordially reciprocates the expression of fraternal regard so frequently received within the past three years from the Most Reverend the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Most Reverend the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Most Reverend the Metropolitan of Athens, and the Holy Governing Synod of the Orthodox Church in Russia, by dignitaries of the Church of England, and by members of this Church, both of the clergy and the laity; that it takes grateful recognition of the courteous action by which the administration of holy rites for the burial of the dead of our communion has been provided for by the authorities of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church; and that it earnestly desires the continuance and increase of such intercourse and mutual good offices of love.

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee on the subject of intercourse with the Russo-Greek Church be continued, and charged with the communication of the foregoing resolution to the venerable authorities of the several branches of the Holy Orthodox Church of the East.

"Resolved, That the said Joint Committee be also charged with the duty of taking further steps for the acquisition and communication of such information as may be mutually important and interesting to this Church and to the Holy Orthodox Church of the East, with such publication thereof from time to time as may be deemed needful and prudent."

ANTHIMUS, by the Mercy of God Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch:

✠To the Rev. Charles R. Hale, Rector of St. John's Church, Auburn, New York, Secretary of the Committee, etc., Greeting in the Lord:

We received with pleasure your letter, with the resolution of the General Convention of the Church in the United States of America, and for the pious sentiments expressed through you toward our most Holy Ecumenical Throne rendering you no ordinary thanks, we offer praise to God, the Author of peace, that of His boundless love and goodness He hath deigned to smooth for us the way toward a nearer approach of our two Churches, a matter which first began to be agitated three years since, during the patriarchate of our revered predecessor, Gregory VI., who so well arranged for the administration of holy rites at the burial of the dead of your communion, and lately made more plain through the manifestations of brotherly kindness toward the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Syra, in his recent visit to England.

Now, when the base designs of evil-minded men surrounding the Church of God do not cease, on every side, to hurl against her the poisonous darts of unbelief, it seems to us that the present is the fitting time to quench, by mutual concession, the feelings of division of the churches, one from the other, which have till now held sway—for reasons known only to the Lord—on account of dogmatic difference; and that we should hold out friendly hands, in order to join together, by the help of the Almighty, what have been separated, and to fulfil the words of our Saviour which He spake, calling upon His Heavenly Father just before His willing death, "That all may be one."—St. John xvii. 21.

Announce, then, these things, and bring them before the Right Reverend Bishops, and the others, clergy and laity, composing the Synod of the Anglican Church in America, and be an interpreter of our desires for mutual conference through writing, and that we shall not cease, so far as in us lies, to strengthen and draw closer, by a nearer fellowship, the holy bond of love, for we are persuaded that thus, and by evangelical love toward each other, we shall come, by the gift of God, to the God-wrought miracle of the unity of the churches.

Since toward the original and archetype of our Orthodox Eastern Church your Church has shown a reverence beyond all others, we, also, heartily loving it, give to its reverend members, as also to you, beloved, our prayers, and bless you with both our hands, invoking the best and saving blessings from God, the Giver of all good, whose grace and boundless mercy be with you.

✠[The Patriarch] of Constantinople, your fervent well-wisher in Christ.

September 9-21, 1872.

ATHENS, September 20, 1872.

Reverend Charles [R.] Hale:

✠ We received with pleasure yours of the 24th of October, of the year past, in which we read with joy the resolutions of the most reverend of the American Church concerning their hearty desire for fellowship, in a spirit of Christian love, with the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ.

This desire and the prayer of the Episcopal Church in America have been harbingers of unspeakable joy to my aged soul, in these last days at least of my life, beholding from afar the rising hope of a coming, prayed for, brotherly drawing near and reunion of the Churches of Christ, to the glory of the Lord whom the Gospel declares to us, our Saviour Christ, the unity of His Holy Church.

The heart of every true Christian is rent at the distressing sight of the present religious separation

and dissension, and, sometimes, even the enmity of Christians, in the world of ideas, and of the Spirit in which all ought to make up again one loving flock, tended invisibly by the one Good Shepherd.

It is high time, then, that we all agree together in this, that it is altogether an unchristian and an unworthy thing that Christians should, in the name of Christ Himself, slander, hate, and persecute one another. It is time that, leaving to the world, and to its rulers, hates, passions, and manifold divisions and differences, in the supernatural dominion of the kingdom of Christ, we should be inspired by His Holy Spirit alone, all of us perfecting in variety a spiritual unity. Fortunately, no one can charge the Eastern Church with being a deserter and a renegade from these cardinal principles of Catholic Christianity. By almost all falsely accused, at times persecuted, and often treated with utter unfairness, to no one has she in an anti-Christian, brother-hating spirit returned the like, but from the first she continues holding up supplanting hands to God in behalf of those who persecute and oppress her.

Sorrowful so often as, for the safety of the Divine principles of the Saviour, she is compelled to take in her hands the scourge to drive out of the temple those making "the house of God an house of merchandise," with gladness she offers most heartily her right hand to all desiring her spiritual fellowship.

Never seeking any worldly advantages, pursuing no devious or hidden political or national aim, leaning upon no earthly support, but being the pure, spiritual fellowship of the faithful wherever they may be, the Eastern Orthodox Church is neither Greek, nor Russian, nor Græco-Russ, nor Russo-Greek, as in your letter it is characterized, as I would it had not been, but one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, binding together, and at the same time raising up, all nations and all peoples into a spiritual unity above all distinctions of race. In this, reverend sir, consists the unity of the Eastern Church, manifold in its members, it is one in its cohesive force and life-giving spirit.

Unity, then, and union with the Orthodox Church, is not a fusion or a taking away of the natural and ethical diversity invrought by God, it is not a slavish subjection of some to others; it is not a despotic raising up or a tyrannical levelling of national peculiarities and differences, but a certain brotherly, harmonious binding together of spirit, manifested through a common creed, voluntarily accepted of the fundamentals of the faith, which the Divine Scriptures, the Apostolic tradition, and the Œcumenical Councils of the undivided Church have defined for us.

Those who, in all places, are thus bound one to another, realize the "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic" Orthodox Church. But that Church, proceeding on the universal and eternal principles of Christian love, does not by any means, being asked, deny even to those not thus realizing her Catholic integrity, her fraternal anxiety for Christian love, and the Christian performance of those fraternal offices to which our human nature gives a claim. In the Orthodox Church, to every one that asketh shall be given; to him that knocketh, it it shall be opened.

Acquainting you, Reverend Sir, and the Right Reverend Bishops of the Church in America, of these things, in all love, and with the best hopes, I pray the All-Wise and All-Good God to pour out upon you, and upon the whole nation of the United States, His blessings, giving to you all brotherly greeting in the Lord, I remain in the Lord, your fervent well-wisher,

✠ THEOPHILUS, of Athens,
President of the Holy Synod.

SOPHRONTIUS, by the mercy of God, Pope and Patriarch of the Great City Alexandria, and of all Egypt.

✠ Most Reverend Presbyter of the Church of St. John, Auburn, New York, our beloved son in the Lord, Charles R. Hale, Grace to your Reverence and Peace from God.

With great joy and Christian interest we received, toward the close of the month of February, the packet sent by your esteemed Reverence, in which were enclosed your own letter to us written on parchment, with the Resolutions of the great Synod of the Church in the United States of America, assembled the 12th—24th of October, 1871, in the city of Baltimore, and the privately printed Report of the Proceedings of the same Synod, written in the English tongue. Translating this into our Greek language, and studying all together with close attention and care, we were truly delighted, and celebrated with praises of the Church the God-inspired zeal, and pious longing, which, following in the footsteps of the English Church, your particular Church also in the United States of America, shows for the unity of all the holy Churches of God, which, by God's inscrutable decrees, are now dis-severed one from another, and more especially for unity with the Holy Orthodox Church. For indeed we are justly persuaded that such manifestations of fraternal sympathy, and of tendencies towards fellowship, increasing and being mercifully made to work effectively, surely cannot but reach, as time goes on, the wished-for goal of catholic unity. On the other hand, it deceives or escapes the observation of no one, that until the Lord vouchsafe the fulfilment of the great work of unity, many inconveniences and stumbling-blocks will exist among us, and many misconceptions on either side and misrepresentations will arise, as also your venerable Committee sets forth in its report sent us; but mutual patience and forbearance, enkindled and enflamed by Christian love, and by the inestimable importance of the great and God-pleasing object at which we aim, can remove all such. We consider, then, as efficient towards the longed-for unity, and foreboding auspicious things, such manifestations of brotherly sentiments in Christ and of tendencies to fellowship towards the strengthening and nourishing of the existing good relations between the Orthodox Church and your own, and also investigations and discussion in brotherly love, such as, on the happy occasion of the consecration of the Orthodox Church in Liverpool, the conference and discussion between the revered Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, our beloved brother in Christ, Alexander Lycurgus, and the Bishop of Ely and those with him.

But, toward a firmer and surer attaining of what is desired, there seems to us, speaking for ourselves, needful the organization of a committee to this end, from either part, of skilled and well-instructed theologians, for the examination and accurate enquiry into existing differences on the basis of the Catholic Orthodox Church before the Great Schism, for thus the mutual relations of sympathy are bound together more closely by a nearer mutual fellowship and acquaintance between the two Churches, and we come with greater spirit and more safety to those things which concern catholic unity. For the speedy organization of such a committee, on the part also of the Orthodox Church of the East, we both pray and hope.

On this happy occasion, it seems to us superfluous to tell your most beloved Reverence, and through you the whole Church of the United States of America, of the great longing with which we have ever been enflamed to see one day completed the great work of unity, and, on account of this, from the time that by the divine mercy we received

three years since the spiritual presidency of the most holy Church of Alexandria, we have never omitted to direct the priests subject to our Patriarchal and Apostolic throne that, if any members of the Anglican Church should depart this life within the city or district committed to their charge, when called upon they should freely go to attend to them, and render the proper rites.

Concerning the extension of this beginning of the burial of Anglicans by Orthodox priests, and vice versa, to Baptism, Marriage, and the Holy Communion, we speak our private opinion that it is necessary concerning this that there should first be a distinct request from the Archbishop of Canterbury, as in the case of burial, and then all the Patriarchs considering it together can give their answer in common. For the Orthodox Church having once decided any part of its Dogma or Canon, no particular Church in the Orthodox Communion can ever, by itself, and of its own judgment, change or transgress anything of what is settled, however small a thing it may be.

Finally giving the blessing of Peace in Christ to the Holy Church of the United States of America, and especially our Church prayers and blessings to your most wise Reverence, we pray that "the God of Peace, which brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant make you" all "perfect in every good work to do His will, making in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

Of your esteemed Reverence the fervent and earnest well-wisher in Christ,

✠SOPHRONIUS of Alexandria.

ALEXANDRIA, April 20, 1873.

HIEROTHEUS, by the mercy of God, Patriarch of the great Divine city Antioch, and of all the East.

To the Most Reverend Charles R. Hale, Presbyter of the Church of St. John, Auburn, New York, our Patriarchal and Apostolic blessing in Christ Jesus our Saviour.

The most valued letter of your Reverence, and the copy of the three resolutions of the Joint Committee, Bishops, Presbyters and Laymen, adopted in the great Synod of the Church of the United States of America, the 12th—24th of the month of October, 1871, with the report of the correspondence which passed the three preceding years between the most holy authorities of the Russo-Greek Church and those of the Anglican Communion, we have recently received, and with great interest have read what is decreed in the aforementioned resolutions, and more especially what is said concerning making enquiry as to friendly relations with the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, and the taking "further steps for the communication of such information as may be mutually important and interesting to this Church and to the Holy Orthodox Church of the East.

Considering with attention what has been written on both sides, we rejoiced at the brotherly kindness and peacefulness of the great aim of the fellowship between the Churches through friendly writings and deeds of true brotherliness and kindness. For truly our Saviour through the Holy Gospels and the Epistles bids us "love one another" and "bear one another's burdens," that so may be fulfilled the law of God. For love is both that which draws together things divided, and strengthens all human fellowships, and prepares for bliss in respect to both. So Christian teaching and philosophy being beneficent, philanthropic and inclined to fellowship, the Orthodox Eastern Church, steadfast on these Godlike principles, continually prays "for the union of all" in the confession of the faith, never overlooking any

peaceful occasion for consultation and discussion with all nations of the earth concerning love one towards another, praying that "all may be one" (St. John, chap. xvii, 21), in Christ Jesus the Saviour of all, and that with one heart we may glorify His blessed name.

On account of these things, what has been resolved by the Great Synod of the United States of America has been a cause of heartfelt joy to us, concerning fellowship with the Orthodox Eastern Church in brotherly love, whose pure results promise the greatest moral benefit to each Church. Wherefore responding thus by this present letter we ask your Reverence to report these things also to the Great Synod of the United States. Now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Patriarchal blessing be with your dear Reverence. Given in Damascus, March 10, 1873, the first year of the Indiction.

✠HIEROTHEUS of Antioch,

Your brother in Christ.

REMARKS OF REV. DR. LEEDS OF MARYLAND UPON THE CANON OF RITUAL.

October 26, 1874.

The House of Deputies, having taken up the Canon of Ritual reported by the Committee on Canons—

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. Mr. President, Rome, it is said, has a place for every man and a field for every form of enthusiasm. She erects an order, she appoints a mission, or she allows a retreat, in which earnest and oftentimes extravagant natures may find free play for their impulses. She can gratify their feelings by setting them off to themselves. But Rome, be it noted, consents to no departure from her settled standards of belief—no measure of compromise that would endanger her doctrine—however much she may yield to peculiarities of taste and of temperament.

Taste and temperament, Mr. President, sometimes make a demand which has no better ground to rest upon than a germinant error in theology. Souls crave a gratification for some spiritual yearning that is awakened in them, perhaps by a false view of truth. They have brought logic to bear upon spiritual mystery, and have drawn conclusions from its sphere with the very same confidence with which they are wont to draw them from that of measurable and definable facts. For instance, in the office of the Holy Eucharist. Because, under the forms of bread and wine, there is a communication to the faithful of Christ's Body and Blood, therefore logic infers that the whole glorified Person of Jesus is so associated with the elements in, with, or about them, not locally, it is claimed, but mystically and in truth, that, under their veil, He ought devoutly to be adored. Therefore the elevation of the elements after the consecrating rite. Therefore the impulse of piety to address its homage in their direction and to express it in act—the denial of which impulse is, by those who feel it, held to be sacrilege. Admit the theology to be correct which underlies this notion, and their remonstrance is just.

Now, sir, I deny the legitimacy of the conclusion that is thus logically drawn.

Its unsoundness is shown in that it can claim no countenance from the Word of God, or from the structure of Primitive Liturgies. Even Mr. Keble, being witness, no direction is to be found in the earliest formularies of devotion to address worship in the sacrament to the Body and Blood of the Lord. In the Liturgies of the East to-day, notwithstanding the inroad of corruption, it cannot be claimed to have found, except constructively, a place. I have seen in Damascus, where the Greek

Church is as debased as anywhere in the world, the elements brought from the prothesis before the act of consecration—after being offered, as with us, in the shape of "oblations"—and, as the deacon bearing the paten, reverently lifted above his head, followed by the priest with the chalice in his hands, made the circuit to the altar, the people fell prostrate upon their faces to the floor, in reverent worship. The Eastern mind is imaginative; almost every action in Oriental worship is symbolical to its eye. The prostrate people before the elements, as the same are carried forward to the altar, see as in a figure the Saviour of the world proceeding to His cross. Hence their adoration of Himself in typical representation. When the sacrifice of commemoration is duly completed, they bow again in lowly homage, but not so emphatically as before. The consecrated symbols are not at that moment presented to them for worship. They are actually screened from their view behind the Eikonostasis, and when, later in the service, the central gates are thrown open, and the symbols are exhibited in the middle of the great entrance, worship is again expressed, but not so markedly as either in the first instance or the second. I infer from this, Mr. President, that the doctrine of Eucharistic adoration, so distinctively called, is not intended to be set forth in the Liturgies of the East. It came in as an after-thought through the Romanizing error of the Council of Bethlehem. No changes in the Rubrics or usages followed that Council. Hence the glaring incongruity, often brought to notice. Hence the manifest mark of innovation in the doctrinal ruling of Bethlehem in 1672.

I object again to the legitimacy of the conclusion that is drawn by logical processes touching the call for adoration toward the sacred symbols, because, in the writings of the Fathers, there is hardly an allusion in its favor. Out of all the discussion upon the Eucharist in which the Fathers abound, the Homilies that enforce its privilege, and the Catechisms that explain it, barely half a score of passages can be adduced that help to support it. In comparison with the treatises that present a view of the sacrament totally different in kind, they are not worthy of consideration. The value of these passages, it is urged, lies in the testimony they furnish to adoration as a practice; against which, however, the Liturgies of antiquity are a damaging witness.

I object, once more, to the conclusion thus arrived at, because with hardly an exception the great Divines of our Church, from the Reformation downward, have ignored or rejected it. If Bishop Andrews, very doubtfully, and Prebendary Thorndike, beyond all dispute, may be called its advocates, there are few others to be mentioned who make any approach to its approval. On the contrary, the teaching of the long catena of our doctors is in quite another direction.

It is only in our day that a formal treatise upon this topic has appeared in the Anglican Church, from a pen dear for its associations with the poetry of the Christian year. For the first time in history, either before or since the Middle Ages, as far as one can discover, a school has been formed to set up and to propagate this theological tenet—a school earnest, enthusiastic, determined, aggressive, all alert and aglow. Why not give license to this view of the Eucharist? Why not let it be taught with freedom in esoteric circles? Why not provide its advocates with an order of their own, or consign its teaching to some safe retreat? Because, as a tenet, it is no longer an individual and exceptional opinion, gleaming out at rare intervals in the long stretches of history; a sentiment, a private view, a sort of faith before God kept to one's self; a thing that, if held to by pious Bishop Andrews, did not appear in his prayers; or, if embraced by learned

Thorndike, did not offend against custom; but taking on form, organization, equipment, power, it threatens at this time to change the very complexion of our formularies and engraft upon them a new and foreign idea; and as the Eucharistic rite is the grand central service of our holy religion, to alter through that the whole tone and color of every subordinate office.

I am grateful, for my own part, for whatever in any way helps to elevate the Eucharist to a more devout observance, and invests its administration with additional sanctity. I thankfully recognize the endeavor to bring more impressively before us, in the service of this altar, the intercession and suffering of Him who always in the Apocalypse is set forth under the figure of "a Lamb, as it had been slain." I am glad of the attempt to make us see in the Holy Communion the representation, as in memory, and the presentation, as in merit, of the one only Sacrifice finished upon the Cross, glassed forth, as it were, in the commemorative act, in which our Saviour comes near to us by His Word and Spirit, to offer Himself to our faith, in His broken Body and His Blood once shed. Further than this in my acknowledgments I cannot go. Beyond this in my views I dare not advance. But the demand is, Go further. I am pushed forward to the admission of a Theophany here present of nothing less than a symbol, corresponding to the pillar of cloud and of fire, to indicate to me that God is manifest—a presence of Jesus veiled under visible signs: whereas in the place of every sort of symbol I am taught by the New Testament that I have the reality itself of Divine Appearance, and not simply the token in the Person of the invisible, all-surrounding, ever-abiding Comforter.

It is to meet and arrest this school of doctrine, not in harshness and intolerance, but with sober judgment, as guardians of truth and conservators of the heritage to which our children have a title, that we are called to legislate. I am sorry for the occasion. I wish it could have been averted, especially in the way of legal repression. I am in favor of law, but law positive, affirmative, authorizing and permitting, the absence or uncertainty of which has given no little apology to present irregularities.

As a temporary and imperfect expedient, a Canon is proposed. It is of the nature of a compromise. Imperfect, I said, because in the Court of Appellate Jurisdiction it leaves open to every diversity and contrariety of rule that can be found in as many different tribunals as may be called upon to administer it. Temporary it must be, for the only competent authority by which this Church can abide is that which, first ascertained after a careful study of law, both written and unwritten, and then supplemented by her Synods wherever it is wanting, shall be adjudged to be law by solemn judicial decisions. Meanwhile, this Canon of Ritual provides for the erection of an Ecclesiastical Court, by which offenders may be arrested, put on trial to answer, and made amenable to control. It is to be hoped that such an appointment as this will operate as a caution, and leave little more to do in the way of restraint.

I shall not analyze this Canon. I leave that to others. I will simply remark that it forbids a few practices, about two or three of which there will be a difference of opinion.

For example, the use of Incense: As a symbol, it may be innocent and expressive. It is its ritual use that is forbidden, which is identified with a purpose that this Church would rebuke. The Ritual Commission of the Lower House of Convocation in 1866 declared that the burning of incense had been practised from the Reformation onward to within

a hundred, yes, fifty years, in cathedrals and chapels, collegiate, royal, and private, of the British dominions. Its object in such cases was reverence or festivity. The godly Bishop of Winchester, among the furnishings of his chapel, had a triquetral censor, on which incense was placed by the clerk when the first lesson of Holy Scripture was on the point of being read. It was for a token of awe and veneration as God was about to speak.

Good George Herbert wrote in his "Country Pastor" how careful the priests ought to be on occasions of festivals to perfume with sweet odors the House of the Lord. This was of the nature as Mr. Scudamore has told us, of a floral decoration or festive embellishment.

Incense properly signifies the merit of Christ, with which, as the Angel of the Covenant, He offers the prayers of His Saints upon the altar in heaven. There is, therefore, in its burning, no necessarily dangerous doctrine or sentiment implied; but its objectionableness arises from the fact of its illegality, and its intended connection with "Eucharistic Adoration."

The same may be said of the Crucifix—constantly used by the Lutherans, and appointed to be placed upon their Holy Table on every occasion of sacramental service. Yet the crucifix is so associated with superstition and corruption, that in the minds of most people it is difficult to put them apart. I need not remark upon Elevations of the Elements, and genuflections and bowings, for they speak for themselves, and are only forbidden because they are avowedly practised for the worship of our Saviour, under the symbols of bread and wine.

Now, there are objections that will be made to any and every Canon that is proposed for enactment. Indeed, to all legislation, whatever its form, there will be opposition; and in passing to consider, as I think it but fair to do, some of these objections, I would be understood to meet them, not as applying to this Canon before us so much as to law in general that is intended to govern us in matters of Ritual. I defer the question of the constitutionality of Canonical regulations to another occasion.

But among objections, Mr. President, I might speak, in the first place, of the earnest longing I have alluded to for Eucharistic Adoration, that must of necessity be denied under a stricter legislation. I need only observe, in addition to what I have said, that the term "Eucharistic Adoration" is a misleading term. We are never forbidden to adore our Redeemer in His Supper, both as seated on His throne and as present with us in its reception. "Sursam corda" is the key-note of grateful though lowly ascriptions. Our adoration must be directed, like that of the Disciples at the Passover, to the Consecrating Priest, our Saviour, and not to the Elements under His sacred hands.

But again: It is objected to be unfair to men who have entered into the Church, and especially to those who have taken Holy Orders—understanding that the Prayer-Book should remain as it is if any new restrictions and limitations are to be put upon its meaning. In answer to which objection, it may very properly be replied that the Prayer-Book has been subjected on several occasions before to the work of revision—sometimes to eliminate what had become liable to abuse, and sometimes to restore after such danger had passed. In every revision the preservation and perpetuity of sound doctrine in its integrity have never been overlooked. Changes have been jealously refused where the faith has been concerned, and they will continue to be so, the only object of legislation being to maintain the Offices just as they are, and to prevent alteration by indirection in rites. Prebendary

Thorndike said two centuries ago that "Eucharistic Adoration" could be rightfully practised when it came to be a custom. To forestall such custom, which may creep insidiously in, Canons like that before us have come to be necessary. The sooner men are stopped by the positive voice of the Church, who enter into her ministry expecting to teach and to practise that which she inhibits, the better.

A third objection is interposed—that the times are not meet for wise and wholesome enactment. Such is the irritation, such the want of intelligence, so few are familiar with Rompotes, Durandus, Pugin, and other writers on Ritual—the stage we have reached in our history as a Church is so wholly transitional, unsettled, and tentative—we are not prepared, it is argued, for a judicious regulation of public worship. I answer that a state of development and progress may be looked for for long years to come; but with the changes that are coming there may quite as easily occur variations for the worse as variations for the better. I do not believe there is the ignorance which is complained of. I am decidedly of the opinion that an intelligent commission can be chosen that, in the calm of their studies and in the course of three years, will be able to report to us, as the result of their labors, such ecclesiastical provisions touching matters of Ritual as, while settling and conserving the doctrine of the Church, will more effectually set forward a lively and significant worship, than any number of experiments in individual cases unguided and unendorsed.

A fourth objection appears in the dread of a tame and monotonous uniformity, to which the Church will be reduced, and the repression of all enthusiasm in her schools of thought. If diversities in temperament and taste were to be denied freedom, if no allowances were to be made of the grand minster rite side by side with the simplicity of the humble chapel, if details in ministration to every minutia of service were to be prescribed and enforced for all places and peoples, then certainly this objection would have great weight, and it would deserve to have it. But the purpose, I submit, of all Ritual regulation is only to debar such features in worship as are incompatible with oneness in the common system set up, and to prevent controversy and antagonism of appearance. Variety, not inconsistent with unity, must be permitted no less in the Kingdom of Grace than in the Kingdom of Nature. A little more or a little less of æsthetical element, a richer or a plainer, a more elaborate or a simpler type in the ministrations of the sanctuary, provided the Church orders it, and spirituality is not hindered, is not to be ruled out by any judicious legislation. Much less are schools of thought to be put into confinement and bondage. It is not sought, and it never can be sought, to make all men exactly alike. The interplay of diversities is the health of the Church. To every school in its measure the Church is under obligation—to the High for the maintenance of Apostolic order and truth, to the Low for pointing to spirituality of life, to the Broad for adjusting relations with science and a more general culture, to the Ritual for quickened service in worship and in charity. To all of them, as a whole, the Church can own herself a debtor, and make large allowances in their favor, if they only be loyal. As the Bishop of Lichfield very beautifully told us in his sermon in Baltimore, the advanced guard of an army may skirmish continually in the front, if it only return promptly at the call of the bugle.

But I must not detain this Convention, except to remark that the most grievous objection alleged against the enactment of either Rubrics or Canons in regulation of Ritual is, that law is cold and un pitying in its sway. Yes, law in itself is unpitying and cold. "The letter always killeth." But law,

after all, is the protection of liberty, and there is no true freedom or security in the want of it. The privileges of the subject are guarded against invasion by the very statute that arms and no less restrains the governor. You must defend the rights of the clergy by erecting over them an elastic and generous, though definite rule, while at the same time you protect the Church by upholding authority.

Law, Mr. President and gentlemen, can never be dispensed with. It is the guardian of order and peace—"the harmony of the universe." The dew-drop falls silently into its place under its direction, and the wild sweep of the storm is obedient to its sovereign control. Law under the New Covenant is no less binding in its moral prescriptions than it was under the Old; and the only difference in its action under the two systems is that in the latter it is accommodated to human infirmity. In other words, it is administered as all law in the Church ever should be administered—with kindness. He who came into the world to restore men to rectitude, and make all righteous, threw His cloak over the sinner. The life of Jesus was charity, and this should be the life of His Church. Grievances against His precept, and therefore against Himself, He forgave.

"Men write their wrongs in marble; He, more just, Stooped down and wrote them in the dust."

The first footfall blotted out their record—the faintest breath of the wind confused and obscured it.

Mr. President, it has been well observed that "the soft pillow sooner breaks the stone than the hardest marble." And the reason is this: That the pillow, yielding, gives the full force of the blow to the stone which is smitten, which otherwise it would divide by taking a part of it to itself.

The Bishop, to be a Bishop, must be gentle, considerate, meek, patient, and skilled to teach. The man who can be touched with a feeling of another's weakness, who himself has done amiss or strayed away, it may be, to the confines of error, is sometimes best qualified, if repentant, for the high and holy vocation of watching over his brethren. His own experiences prove his ripest qualification. The gentleness in some men of their mother's blood in their veins, or the chivalry of their father's spirit in their breasts, leads them always to interpose for persons in error; more to rescue than to punish, more to influence them for the better than to drive them to the worse. A manly sympathy, wedded to a manly adhesion to duty, looks well to see if it cannot possibly effect by the former what it is bound in conscience to accomplish by the latter. The feeling, perhaps, that in new adjustments and relations, with new checks brought to bear upon an offending party, he may avoid past faults, compels many a noble spirit to generous suffrages towards him.

This is the kind of temper which, in a true father of his flock, will save law from becoming cruel. The secret of all right government is power tempered with charity, and guided with sound discretion.

A Bishop will endeavor to put himself into relation to all of his clergy in a way to do justice to them and no injustice to the Church. Your storied windows are only daubs and patches when seen from without. They must be looked at from within. There is always some point of sight from which the well-meaning, though it may be perverse, conclusions of another may be considered with candor; and where falsehood and heresy do not stand in the way, the chief pastor of a diocese will endeavor to get at it—not to compromise, but to gain influence and to recover.

A Bishop now no more of earth—one of the wisest this Church has ever known—used to employ the leading men of a party to restrain and to correct its less sober members. I have known a Bishop—still among the living—who, on the point of making public his condemnation of certain practices in a particular congregation which he despaired of correcting in a more private way, gladly accepted the interposition of one of his presbyters, who approached the rector of the congregation complained of, and, after long closeting and comparison of view, succeeded in obtaining his consent to every change which had been demanded by the Bishop. And not only so, but the effect of that interview was to elicit an expression of thanks from the clergyman for the gift of new light and for kindly dealing.

Law comes to bear on men, where it is not defiantly treated, through a fatherly and brotherly ministrations.

It is in this way that the Church expects it—always expects it—to operate. It is not meant for oppression and bondage. It is the Bishop's guide and support when called to administer discipline, and it is equally the agis of both clergy and people against possible injustice; but most certainly, at all times, under any wise government, the precept of a loving though faithful shepherd.

In this persuasion, Mr. President, I wish to record my vote in favor of the Canon now presented to this House; and, being called from the city by pastoral engagements I cannot fail to meet, I shall, in the event of final action upon this action during my absence, ask the privilege of so doing upon my return.

*** TWENTY-SECOND DAY.

SATURDAY, October 31.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the Creed by Rev. J. H. Knowles, Canon of the Cathedral, Chicago, Ill. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. Archibald Beatty, of Kansas. The Benediction was pronounced by Rev. J. H. Knowles, of Illinois.

SPANISH TRANSLATION OF PRAYER-BOOK.

The PRESIDENT appointed as the Committee on the Spanish Translation of the Prayer-Book, Rev. W. D. Wilson, D.D., LL.D., Charles R. Hale, M.A., Henry Coffee, LL.D., and Professor F. Fred. Crane, M.A.

TRUSTEES OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I ask general consent for the introduction of a resolution that I deem to be exceedingly important, and the House of Bishops are desirous of getting it to-day, if possible:

"Whereas, Under existing laws the number of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary has become so large as to interfere with thorough efficiency in its government; therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a commission, composed of two Bishops, two Clerical and two Lay Deputies, be appointed to consider what legislation may be necessary to enable the Trustees to govern the Seminary with increased efficiency, and to report to the General Convention at its next session; said commission having power to confer with the several Dioceses having an interest in the Seminary, and to take such other action as may be necessary to perfect the plan or plans that the Commission may desire to propose to the General Convention."

There are now three hundred and sixty Trustees, and by and by they will get up to a thousand, and

this is a mere proposition to appoint a commission to enquire. I move that the resolution be adopted. Leave was granted to introduce the resolution, and it was adopted.

THE NEW HYMNAL.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would ask unanimous consent to a resolution to concur in the message of the House of Bishops (No. 73), sent in last evening, about the Hymnal, which, as I understand, is to take off the title-page the words in reference to the action of the last Convention, and put in what we all agreed to. The main point, however, the direction in regard to music, is put in as a Canon. I ask unanimous consent to a resolution to now concur in that message. The Trustees want to go right on and print the book, and I am afraid we shall lose it in the pressure of business.

The message was concurred in.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Whereas, The New York Bible and Common Prayer-Book Society having provided for the publication of an edition of the standard Prayer-Book as set forth by the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, at the meeting of the General Convention in 1871, without any expense whatever to the Church, and

"Whereas, We understand that the issue of this Book by said Society involved an outlay of over five thousand dollars, thus precluding the possibility of its being published as a business venture of any publishing house. Therefore,

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That we hereby recognize this act of great liberality on the part of the New York Bible and Common Prayer-Book Society, and express our thanks therefor."

RELIEF FUND.

Rev. Dr. SHELTON, of Western New York, from the Committee to nominate trustees of the fund for the relief of widows and orphans of deceased clergymen, and of aged, infirm, and disabled clergymen, reported the following names as trustees:

The Bishop of Delaware, the Bishop of Easton, Rev. H. C. Potter, D.D., Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., Stephen P. Nash, Esq., Wm. Alexander Smith, Esq., and Lloyd W. Wells, Esq.

The nominations were confirmed.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The nomination of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary was suspended the other day on my motion. I move now that that resolution be taken from the Calendar for the purpose of action.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution reported by the Committee on the General Theological Seminary was adopted as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Trustees named in the accompanying list be confirmed as members of the Board of the General Theological Seminary for the next three years."

ILLNESS OF REV. DR. D. R. GOODWIN.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. If it is in order I should like to say a word of explanation in reference to a question of privilege. Yesterday or the day before, one of the speakers referring to a Deputy from the Diocese of Pennsylvania, who is absent, and speaking of him by name (Rev. Dr. Goodwin), referred to the fact that he was unable to be present in this Convention on account of ill health, and he used the phrase that his present sickness was the beginning of the end. I wish, in behalf of the Rev. Dr. Goodwin, to correct any impression which this might give rise to. The Reverend Deputy from Pennsylvania has been prevented

from attendance here by sickness; but he is in the way, as he believes, and as his physicians inform him, of a perfect restoration to health. I wish to correct the impression, and I would like the fact to appear, if possible, in some way, on the records of the Convention.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. I made the remark. I was misinformed by some of his friends, and I regret that they did not rise at the time to correct me. I have had the correction made in the printed report, and I have also written to Dr. Goodwin.

THE PRESIDENT. I do not think that it could possibly appear on the records of the Convention.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. I suppose not; but it will appear in the printed report of our proceedings.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Rev. Mr. SHIPMAN, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Elections, reported that leave of absence for the remainder of the session had been granted to Rev. Mr. Goodale, of Nebraska; Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss, of Delaware; Rev. Dr. Humes, of Tennessee; Rev. Dr. Hutton, of Maryland; Mr. Parker, of Virginia; Mr. Bodley, of Missouri; Mr. Meads, of Albany; Mr. Jackson, of Maine; Mr. Churchill, of Kentucky; and Mr. Curtis, of Delaware.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I wish to ask whether it be in order to move a resolution in regard to the adjournment, with a view to testing the judgment of this House as to the time of final adjournment. It is well known that on Tuesday next many of the members of this House will necessarily be absent, a large number of them on account of the elections taking place in this State and some of the adjoining States. We shall then have been four weeks in session, and it will be almost impossible for many of the delegations to be longer represented here. It seems to me that if it be possible for us to close our business on Monday, it would be very desirable that it should be known in advance at what time we shall eventually adjourn. With a view, not of anticipating the judgment of this House, but of bringing out its view on that subject, I offer a resolution that this House will adjourn, the House of Bishops concurring, on Monday next.

SEVERAL DEPUTIES. At what hour?

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Say at two o'clock, so as to enable members who deem it necessary to go home to reach their homes by Tuesday.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman whether he is willing to stay here until four o'clock to-day? They will give us the church until four, but if we go off at two o'clock we shall lose two hours. If the gentleman is in earnest—

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I am in earnest.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Then let us stay until four o'clock to-day.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I have made the motion that we adjourn at two o'clock on Monday next, if the House of Bishops concur; and I made that motion with the view of bringing out the sense of the House on the subject. Very few of the delegations will be full after Monday.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I second the motion, with the understanding that we shall remain in session as long as we can to-day, and do all the business we can.

Mr. STARK, of Connecticut. I move to amend the resolution of the Deputy from Albany by striking out "Monday," and inserting "Tuesday." I make this motion because I am thoroughly satisfied that we cannot keep the larger portion of the body together after Tuesday to transact business, and those who necessarily go away to-day will not re-

turn early enough on Monday to transact business that day with that order and deliberation which ought to characterize the proceedings of this House. If we fix the time for Tuesday, two o'clock, we shall have all day Monday and Monday evening. I express my own personal feelings about the matter by my amendment.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I beg to say to the gentleman that his amendment would defeat the object of the greater part of the persons who wish to go away. We have five Dioceses in this State represented. Their Deputies want to go home to vote on Tuesday, and they must leave here on Monday to enable them to do so. Elections take place in other States besides this, and the same thing occurs.

Mr. DE ROSSETT, of North Carolina. I move to refer this matter to the Joint Committee on Closing Exercises.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Perhaps we might close our business on Monday at two o'clock; but an extension of time would be required to hear the pastoral letter, but that would not require the attendance of members here for business. Of course we would comply with all that was courteous to the House of Bishops in respect to hearing the Pastoral Letter; but I want it understood that our business shall close on Monday immediately after lunch.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Make it five o'clock.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. If that is not done, we shall have very poor legislation, for there are a great many men from the West who will go whether or not, and if there is only a quorum left there may be very poor legislation.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. I am sure this House would be unwilling to do anything of that kind. I think we may trust the propriety of members of this House not to act on important business when nearly all the members are absent.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Of course they will not; but I have known one of the best Canons we had to be run out just precisely at the end of the session, because of an absence of men.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. It seems to me, even if we have a quorum, there will be gentlemen representing Dioceses who would want to be present. You may agree on the legislation that they would oppose with all their power if they were here. If you are only going to act on matters of mere form, a bare quorum would be sufficient.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. What is the question?

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Mr. Meads as amended by Mr. Stark, but I think the whole matter had better be referred to the Committee on the closing services of the Convention, so that they may enquire and report to the House at the proper time.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move, then, that these two resolutions be referred to the Committee to enquire and report at the earliest time.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would also suggest the propriety of the Committee reporting at the same time what are the important matters that must be considered, so as to get an idea of what must come up, and let us do those things before we scatter, because if there was only a quorum left no gentleman would allow himself to press to a vote any important matter. I do not think it would be fair or right.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. That Committee will inform itself.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Had we not better get the sense of the House by voting on Mr. Meads' motion?

The PRESIDENT. Does Mr. Meads accept the

suggestion of Mr. Welsh to refer the matter to the Committee on Closing Services, and let them report as soon as they can?

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. Very well, with the understanding that they shall report this morning.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to refer the matter to the Committee on Closing Services.

Mr. STARK, of Connecticut. Would it be not more orderly to lay the resolution on the table and call it up from the table when the Committee is prepared to report, it being understood that it is to lie there until that time? I move that the resolution lie on the table for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

TO-DAY'S SESSION.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Now I move that the House to-day remain in session until four o'clock. The Committee must know that we will do that before they report. If you go away at two o'clock to-day, we shall have to remain until Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Last night the House appointed eleven o'clock to-day for the consideration of the report on the Baptismal Rubric. I propose that that order of the day be changed from eleven to two, in order to accommodate the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I object, because many members have to leave to-day to attend to their duties on Sunday, and this is too important a measure to be acted on in a thin House.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. When that subject went over by the interference of another special order, I had become entitled to the floor, but the calling up of the other order prevented my saying anything on the subject. I desire to have what I say on that subject heard by as many of this body as it is possible to have; and the reason given by the Clerical Deputy from Maryland is a very sound one, in my judgment, that this afternoon a great many of the clergy will necessarily have gone home at the hour named, and therefore my remarks will fail to reach points that I think they ought to reach. For that reason I am opposed to the motion.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I did not suppose there would be any objection, but I withdraw the motion.

CANON ON RITUAL.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. With the permission of the House, I ask leave to present the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreement between the two Houses on the Ritual question. The Secretary will please read the report.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Committee of Conference appointed by the two Houses to consider the differences between the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies in regard to the additional section to Canon 20, Title I, 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer,' have had the same under consideration, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That instead of the section as passed by the House of Deputies, and proposed to be amended by the House of Bishops, the following additional section be added to Canon 20, of Title I, 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer':

"Sec. 2. [1.] If any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made to him in writing by two or more of his Presbyters, that within his jurisdic-

tion ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced by any minister during the celebration of the Holy Communion, such as—

"a. The Elevation of the Elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made.

"b. Any act of adoration of or toward the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations or genuflections; and,

"c. All other like acts not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

"It shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his Council of Advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2.] If after investigation it shall appear to the Bishop and Standing Committee that ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have in fact been introduced as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop by instrument of writing under his hand to admonish the Minister so offending to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3.] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon, the minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be notified, and have opportunity to be heard in his defense. The charges preferred and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceedings in the case.

"By order of the Committee on the part of the House of Bishops.

"J. WILLIAMS, Chairman.

"By order of the Committee on the part of the House of Deputies.

"WILLIAM COOPER MEAD, Chairman."

Rev. DR. WILSON, of Central New York. I wish to call attention to one word under specification "c." It says "all acts." I think grammar requires it to be "any act."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Committee on Canons proposed, inasmuch as this report by the Committees of Conference would be presented in each House, that we take no action for the present upon the report made by our Committee of Conference, but await the action of the Bishops on the report of their Committee. That will give time for members of this House to examine this question and see exactly what the result of this Conference is. It is probable that the Canon, inasmuch as it received the unanimous approval of their Committee, as it did also of our own, will pass their House during the course of the day, and will come down to us by message during the day. It is so hoped; and it is quite possible that when this matter is explained there will be no opposition on the part of this House to this report, and to the Canon which the Committee have reported, and it may go through, as I believe it will, unanimously, and we may close up this question during the course of the day. If, however, when the message from the Bishops shall come down to this House, it be desirable that it shall lie over for further investigation and examination, there will be no objection, I presume, to making it the order of the day at any time on Monday morning, giving us the intervening time to examine it.

I have been requested, however, to state in a

very few words what the sum and substance of this report is, so far as it differs from the Canon originally passed by the House, and I am prepared to say that the only substantial change made in the Canon by the Committee of Conference is by striking out the first two specifications in the original Canon. Otherwise it remains substantially as it was when it passed this House.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. Please state what the changes are.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Incense, and the use of the crucifix during the administration of the Holy Communion. The report which came from the House of Bishops, and the Canon as sent down to us by them, did make a very serious change. It altered entirely the whole scope and effect of the Canon. It altered it, as I believe, to a much greater extent than the Bishops intended to alter it. That, however, is not important to be considered now. The result is, that we, by our joint committees, have restored the Canon to the same condition that it was in when it was presented originally by the Committee on Canons of this House, with the exception of striking out the two first specifications.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. May I ask a question? I would like the gentleman to inform us the reason for striking out those two specifications.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Well, sir, the reason, as I understand it, of course depends upon the individual vote that was given. There were different reasons given. The chief reason was that the Canon, as it stood before the House originally, was logically inconsistent with itself, inasmuch as it set forth that the use of incense and the use of the crucifix did set forth or symbolize false or doubtful doctrine. Some of each Committee were of opinion that that was in a sense true, and that they could consistently vote for it; but I understand that a majority of the House of Bishops would not vote for it, simply for that reason, because they could not conscientiously say that they considered the use of incense at any time during the services of the Church as symbolizing or setting forth a false doctrine, however objectionable it might be in itself, and however desirous they might be of forbidding its use.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I desire, sir, to understand fully whether this question will come back to this House after we have sent the report to the House of Bishops, for our final concurrence?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. If the Bishops disapprove of the report of their Committee, then we shall know where we stand; but if they approve it, as I presume they will, they will send down the Canon, exactly word for word, as we have reported it, and it will then come before us simply on the question of concurrence. Therefore, it is not necessary for us now to take any action on the report we have made, or on the Canon which we have presented.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. May I ask the question, Will it, therefore, be considered that it is lawful to use incense?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Not at all. On the contrary, the proviso to the Canon we report is to the effect that any minister who does any act in violation of law may still be presented and tried under the provisions of Canon 2, Title II., leaving that as it was before. We do not interfere with that; we simply provide that where two Presbyters, or the Bishop on his own motion, shall be of the opinion that acts or practices during the celebration of the Holy Communion have been introduced, which set forth or symbolize false or doubtful doctrine, it shall be the duty of the Bishop and Standing Committee to make investigation, and if they find that such acts and practices have been in

troduced, to admonish the minister, and then if he still continues in their use, to have him tried for a breach of his ordination vows in so disregarding the admonition of his Bishop.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. That is exactly what I supposed.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. But, if the gentleman will permit me, with the proviso that nothing in this Canon contained shall prevent that minister from being tried, and if found guilty disciplined for any unlawful act which he may have committed, no matter what it may have been; and if the use of incense is unlawful—that of course this Canon does not decide—but if in fact the use of incense be unlawful, then he may be tried for an unlawful act just as before.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. But the conclusion the Committee come to is that the use of incense and the setting up of the crucifix do not teach or symbolize unsound doctrine, and that therefore they may be used.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. No, sir, not at all.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I should like to ask whether there is not danger that the House of Bishops are waiting for us to act while we are waiting for them to act?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. No, sir; it was understood in the Committee of Conference last night, when we met, that such would be the course of action, and they expect to act on it immediately.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of Connecticut. I feel certain that this subject ought to be acted on to-day, while members are here. Many will go away to-day, and to-morrow being the first Sunday of the month, they will want to be in their parishes to administer the Holy Communion, and very many cannot get back here by Monday noon. What I want, and I believe this House wants, is that this subject come up and be disposed of to-day before one o'clock. Why should we wait for the House of Bishops to act? Why can we not act ourselves, and transmit the Canon to them, and see whether they will confirm our action, as we have done on other subjects and as we did before on this? Why should we wait for them to act and transmit their action to us? I hope we shall proceed at once to act upon the report made by the Committee of Conference.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. I am decidedly of the opinion that that is the correct view to take, unless there is some hidden reason.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. There is certainly no objection on the part of the Committee to immediate action. It was only in deference to what we presumed would be the feeling of the House, not to act on so important a matter simply on a verbal report, without having an opportunity of seeing for themselves what these changes were, and verify what I have stated in regard to the substantial effect of the report.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that the message of the House of Bishops be amended so as to conform to the report of the Conference Committee, and be adopted by this House.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I would amend by moving that the report of the Committee on Conference be adopted.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. If the feeling of the House be to act now, the proper motion would be to approve the report of the Committee of Conference, and adopt the Canon which they have reported.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Then I understand it goes to the House of Bishops, and if they concur that is the end of it. ["Yes."] If this vote is to be taken now, Michigan demands a vote by orders.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I can perceive a great difficulty in taking the vote at present. We

had better await the action of the House of Bishops. If we pass this act now, it passes out of our hands altogether; we have no control of it, and it might not pass the other House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Allow me to say one word in regard to the question of taking this vote by orders. I have good reason to believe that if it be put to a *viva voce* vote, there will not be a single dissenting voice in this House; but if it were put to a vote by orders, there might be some negatives.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I appreciate that fact, but nevertheless, Michigan will demand a vote by orders in this case when it comes to the final vote.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. The delegation from Albany make the same demand.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I merely want to say one word in regard to the Canon as reported. There are some things in favor of it, and one thing against it. In the first place, it seems to me that the amendment which has been adopted by the Committee of Conference is a very valuable amendment, because it confines the Canon to the celebration of the Holy Communion, and requires two facts to be proved with regard to the acts to be brought forward: First. That they symbolize erroneous or doubtful doctrines; and, Second. That they are not authorized or ordained in the Book of Common Prayer. That, I hold, is the first change, and I regard it as a valuable one.

In the next place, there are two specifications left out, which said that the use of incense and the use of the crucifix symbolized false doctrine. I hope the reverend gentleman from Pennsylvania will believe it when I say that nothing in this Canon possibly authorizes the use of incense or the use of the crucifix. It leaves that just where it was before. If it was lawful before, it is lawful now; if it was unlawful before, it is still unlawful.

Rev. Mr. BOLTON, of Pennsylvania. That is just the trouble.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I want to say still further that I can understand how the House of Bishops might have made this amendment without entering upon the question of its symbolizing false doctrines, for there was a very curious thing in that Canon as it stood before. It said that the use of the crucifix and the use of incense was unlawful during the celebration of the Holy Communion. Therefore, it could have been inferred by cunning people that the use of the crucifix and the use of incense were allowable in other services than the Holy Communion; and I can imagine a very magnificent ceremony that perhaps some Ritualists might have gotten up; and I can tell what it is. The crucifix brought into the Church, kept in it all through the service up to the time of the celebration of the Holy Communion, reverently borne by acolytes out of Church when the celebration began, and then the clergyman getting up and saying, "We had the crucifix in the Church up to the time of the celebration of the Holy Communion, and took it out when the Holy Communion begins, because when the real presence is there the symbolic representation is out!" [Laughter.] Therefore I think it is a very wise process to cast out those two things.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Does the Roman Catholic Church remove the crucifix?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I do not know anything about the Roman Catholic Church. I leave that to my brother from Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

There is one thing which I believe must be granted, and that is to say, that adoration is a twofold act. It is both internal and external. The internal act is an act of inner worship, praise, prayer,

thanksgiving, or all blended together. The external act is some ceremony which represents that internal feeling. Now, I suppose that since the sacrament is twofold—it consists of “an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace”—for sacramental worship there is needed, first, the internal act, and, secondly, the external ceremony, but aught in the nature of that external ceremony may be properly regulated by the Church for its members. It may forbid this or it may forbid that, according to its judgment and according to the temper and tone of the times. If the Church were to forbid all external adoration, I believe it would be doing a cruel wrong to its children; but if it says, “You shall not genuflect,” or it says, “You shall not prostrate yourself,” or it says, “You shall not bow,” it may be doing just what it has a right to do.

Now, then, I understand that these specifications permit the act of adoration, which is the act of kneeling, which fully, I think, covers all that the devout heart wants; and it does not say that kneeling symbolizes false doctrine or doubtful doctrine; it merely says the other things symbolize it; and therefore though I would not of my own will vote for these two hard things if I had my own choice, for I would prefer to permit the children of the Church some warmer expression of their internal adoration, yet if this Church think it best to limit it to kneeling, I am perfectly satisfied. The consequence is that I can vote for this Canon entirely as expressing the present mind of the Church with only one exception, and if I vote against it, it will be because of the exception. It is this: that I am afraid the Canon is unconstitutional. I am myself not much given to constitutional amendments, but ever since there has come this great *approchement* between myself and the delegation from Virginia, who are always very keen on the subject of constitutional amendments, I have been educated in that direction. I find whenever there is any practical work in hand, like the shortening of the services, we will say, or like a court of appeals—things that everybody believes we need—then a constitutional amendment is necessary. In other words, our Constitution stands apparently always in the face of work; but when it comes up to the question of whether there shall be a little more liberty in ceremonial, then the Constitution is very elastic. Here is my difficulty, and I will state it; it seems to me just this: That to allow ceremonies by Canon is to interfere with the law of the Rubric, to prohibit ceremonies by Canon is also to interfere with the law of the Rubric; and so, if I do not vote for this, it will be simply on the ground that I have been trained by Virginia to respect the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for the order of the day has arrived.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of privilege. I wish to make a statement that the Kentucky deputation desired to make yesterday afternoon, in reference to the private paper circulated here for the procuring of subscriptions to aid the Presiding Bishop of this Church. If the statement had been made then, it would perhaps have been full of indignation. We have slept quietly over it, and we now wish to make a simple, quiet, calm little statement, which we think will vindicate the Presiding Bishop from any intention to reflect on his Diocese, and will satisfy this House that the Diocese has not been short in the performance of its duty to its Bishop.

There was a report made to the House before we went into secret session yesterday upon the plan proposed for the aid and relief of the Presiding

Bishop by this General Convention. The Presiding Bishop says, in reference to that:

“The plan of the Bishop of Nebraska.”—

Who, it seems, originated the matter.

—“did not originate in any word of complaint on my part, but out of an ideal scheme of his own, which I discouraged, but did not feel at liberty to forbid. The only real interest.”—

I would call the attention of the House to this.

—“The only real interest I have felt in it has been the hope of relieving Kentucky of a part of its heavy burden.”

No intimation that Kentucky has not done its duty to the full, as I am sure you will be satisfied it has, when I state that Kentucky, with a list of communicants numbering about four thousand, has been paying six thousand five hundred dollars per year for the support of the Episcopate, taxing my own parish, for example, where there are five hundred and twenty-five communicants, twelve hundred dollars per year, exclusively for the support of the Episcopate. Our Bishop, feeling that he was not residing in the Diocese, that he was rendering comparatively little service to the Diocese, residing in the East as the Presiding Bishop of the Church, wished to relieve us of some little of the heavy burden, as he calls it, which the Diocese was called upon to bear, hoping to relieve us of a thousand dollars a year, not that his income should be increased that amount. I think that explains that. He says further:

“In the form which it now has taken.”—

Having reference to the private circular which was being distributed here.

—“it is as profoundly regretted by me as it can possibly be by the delegation. Pray explain to the House, and beg the idea of a private subscription to be withdrawn.”

This is signed—

“B. B. SMITH.”

I will simply state in this connection that the Diocese has met its obligations to its Bishop up to this time, being short all through the year, except to the amount of but a little over three hundred dollars, which will be paid him, I suppose, beyond question. When he requested of the Diocese that he might reside in the East, and absent himself from his Diocese, we not only gave our consent to it in order to comply with his wishes, but raised a purse to give him as a present, in addition to the money paid by the Diocese for his support, making the contribution of the Diocese for that year about seven thousand dollars, simply for the support of the Episcopate. Never has our Bishop uttered one word of complaint because the amount which was contributed as his salary was not adapted to his necessities. And we have never known anything of his desire to relieve the Diocese, or have money contributed from another source. We do not wish to be relieved.

I will simply state that the Rev. Dr. Schenck, who has had the matter in hand, would be glad to make a short statement to the House.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I think I shall be pardoned if I say one word after the remarks which have been made, not to set myself right, but as to the action of the Special Committee, of which I was a member. I can only say that this matter has been undertaken by those who had it in charge by something which proceeded from the household, and I, for one, was very happy to do anything in my power to further what I knew that desire to be, as I have it in my pocket in a letter signed by one who is regarded as the committee of one in that household upon expenses. I attempted to do it with the utmost delicacy, and said that I desired, as far as the appropriation from the House was concerned, that if the Committee on Expenses declined doing anything they would just throttle the

subject and say nothing about it before the House, and I so told a member of that Committee when, as he supposed, the matter was still inchoate! but to my surprise the report was made to the House rather adversely. I said nothing, but suffered the House to take its vote upon it. It was agreed in the Special Committee, and so stated in its report, that a conjoint action by way of private subscription should be gotten up for this purpose. The Committee was unanimous in that matter. A little circular marked "private," and intended only for the Lay Deputies of the House, was circulated, until a protest was made by the delegation from Kentucky yesterday, when, of course, the circulation of the circular was stopped.

I only want to say that this matter has been done entirely outside of any association with the Diocese of Kentucky. The presiding Bishop has left Kentucky because, by reason of his age and infirmities, being fourscore, he is unable to pay the long visitations and make the arduous journeys which the discharge of his heavy duties in his Diocese involved. He was allowed the assistance of an assistant, and will soon have, I suppose, another Assistant Bishop in that Diocese. Meanwhile he has moved to New York, where he can attend to the duties devolving on him by his office as Presiding Bishop. In this matter we have only to deal with him as Presiding Bishop. We consider it very indelicate to interfere in any position that exists between the Bishop and his Diocese. It is not our business, and therefore we did not even go to the Kentucky delegation, lest we might be compromised in that matter. We only know him as residing here in our midst as our Presiding Bishop, and as such he belongs just as much to the Diocese of Long Island as he does to the Diocese of Kentucky. It was in view of his relations to the Church at large that this action was proposed and attempted to be carried through with the utmost delicacy.

I wish here distinctly to say, that the only object we have had in this matter—and the Committee was unanimous, consisting of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three Laymen—to afford relief, which we are informed upon the highest authority and in writing, which I hold in my pocket, is necessary at this time, and we have attempted to do it as delicately as possible. I wish my dear friends of the Kentucky delegation would not be so sensitive. We have never cast the slightest reflection on Kentucky. We think Kentucky has done her duty nobly in this matter. We only propose to do a little something here for the dear old Bishop who has come to reside in our midst as Presiding Bishop alone, and as such we felt that in all delicacy we had a right to make the attempt. That is all.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOP ORRICK.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Resolved, That the House proceed to sign the testimonials of the Rev. William Pendleton Orrick, Missionary Bishop-elect, with jurisdiction in Shanghai.

PRESENCE OF A QUORUM,

The SECRETARY. I have made enquiries from every delegation, clerical and lay, in regard to the possibility of our having a quorum on Tuesday next, if necessary. There will be here on Tuesday next, God willing, representatives in the clerical order of thirty-nine Dioceses, and in the lay order of thirty-four, just as many as we have this day.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Canons, respecting Canon 4, Title II., of the Digest be made the order of the day for Monday next, at two o'clock."

This Canon was brought before the General Convention by order of the Convention of Massachusetts. Many of us feel it a very important subject, and we wish to have a specific time appointed for it. It is on the dissolution of the connection between ministers and other parties.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, when Mark Antony made the address over the dead body of Julius Caesar, he said:

"Friends, Romans, countrymen,
Lend me your ears;
I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him."

I feel a great deal so, sir, in reference to this petition, of which I stand here as an advocate, with, however, this emendation upon the speech of Mark Antony: I come, I fear, to bury the petition, but then I come to praise it.

We have had upon this subject already a very able argument from him who never argues otherwise than ably, my revered friend from Virginia [Rev. Dr. Andrews]. When he enters the field of argument he swings a sickle so thorough as leaves but little else to be gleaned by them who follow him. Nevertheless there is one point to which I shall presently call your special attention. Meanwhile let me give you a little history of the matter. My friend from Virginia took precedence rightly enough, because he stands before you representing the dignity of a Diocese. I follow him, naturally and properly enough, because I represent individuals, and yet sir, a goodly array of individuals, more than five hundred. Five hundred and one names of clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church are annexed to this petition, and since the petition has been rendered there have been other names added, making it amount to five hundred and ten or five hundred and twelve; and from reports and information received from various quarters, there can be little or no room to doubt that, if the circulars that were sent out had reached those for whom they were destined, we should have been able by this time to have enlarged the list of subscribers to about six hundred, making one-fifth of the whole body of the clergy of this Church. As it is, it is more than a sixth.

The other day when I sat here and we took the vote upon the question of the Canon on Ritual which came so near to entire unanimity, I think the feeling went abroad through the assembly, almost a feeling of supernatural influence, as if there were an overruling power here greater than ourselves disposing us to be of one mind, and a sense of awe crept upon men's spirits, and they looked at each other and said, "Is it not amazing?" Now, sir, double the number of this assembly and bring them here in the form of petitioners for this object for which I plead to-day, and let them sound forth the unanimous "aye," and then should we not stand still more in awe of such a demonstration that would seem still more like an inspiration? That is the character of the appeal that is made to you to-day. One-sixth and more than one-sixth of the whole body of the clergy of the Church, who if assembled here would more than easily fill this inclosure, come, and as with one voice ask relief.

Now, sir, when these circulars were sent out, they met with a various reception, from some an eager reception. "Gladly," they said, "will I sign that petition. My own conscience had been ag-

grieved many and many a time." Answers of a different sort came from others. High Churchmen, men who disagreed with the theory, kindly, most fraternally, and in some cases, appending their negative reply, to a treatise upon the virtue and efficacy of infant baptism and upon the whole doctrine of baptismal regeneration, for which, of course, we were much obliged to them. There were other replies, however, not quite so courteous. One, for instance, writes back, "*Obsta principis, no.*" On another card was this signature, "Ananias the Second," as if it were a group of liars that had come in upon the Church, the legitimate successors of him who was slain for a falsehood. Another card came with a very peculiar signature, "The Devil." [Laughter.] I do not know whether the writer meant by the use of that term to characterize this petition, or whether it was the writer's own *nom de plume*. [Laughter.] It was a significant title, but inasmuch as he was a clergyman, I suppose we should give him the benefit of the doubt. Still there remains, with all the dissent, this solid assent from the clergy of the Church to this body for relief.

And now, what do they ask? What is the character of their request? On the face of it, the simplest thing in the world, to change essentially one word in a Rubric; to put in another place an alternative allowance. The whole thing is in a nutshell. It seems as if the Church, by a single word, could crack the nut, solve the difficulty, and give peace throughout our borders.

Why do they ask it? They ask it because they say their consciences are aggrieved in the use of certain formulas of words in the service for the baptism of infants. We all know what it is. You remember that in the address after the baptismal service there is used language which implies the absolute connection between the baptismal act and the responding gracious effect. In the thanksgiving, likewise, at the close, there is the same connection of absolute cause and effect. Now, let us see how far this is allowable, and how far, if for any reason, it is not allowable. Let us run our eye over the various theories of baptism which are entertained in this Church of ours. Those of you who have read Mosely's exhaustive work will easily understand what I mean. He gives the whole history of every theory that is known. Those of you who have read a pamphlet by my reverend brother from Virginia are likewise well informed on that subject. But let me remind you now in what respects all the theories essentially agree except one.

I will take first the theory that holds to a change of state merely, the theory of Bishop Henry Onderdonk and of the late Bishop Hopkins, a mere external relationship wrought by the external act of baptism. Plainly enough that change takes place *ipso facto*. The baptism being the introduction into the house, the entrance into the house is completed by baptism. But, again, there is another theory which is called the germ theory, contemplating as the result of baptism in the case of the infant—for of that alone I speak—the deposit in the soul of the recipient of a certain sprout or germ of grace, as it is called, which may there abide, giving no demonstration of its subsistence by any actual expression,* and possibly buried, wrapped up in the ceremonies of the grave like a kernel of corn in an Egyptian mummy, until by and by, in long-coming years, when the mummy is unwrapped, and the sun shall shine upon it and the dew shall fall and the soil be given it, it shall sprout into sacred, holy fruitfulness. Something like this is the theory that supposes a certain spark of divine life implanted in the infant's breast in the moment of baptism, but to be quenched, perhaps, by the first act of volun-

tary transgression, no matter how young the boy or girl may be, so that it be voluntary—a boon which it would seem hardly worth thanking God for.

There is another theory: I take that of Robertson, representing the Broad Church theory, that in the plan of God from the beginning man rose with the promise at Eden—"the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head henceforth"—there has been no original sin, no innate depravity, but all children, of all races, born into this world, are by virtue of their human birth children of grace and of God, and the baptismal ceremony is merely the official inauguration of the subject into the official position which belongs to him, just as a prince is a royal personage, though he have not been yet crowned.

Kindred to this is the theory that grows out of a certain system of thought springing from the incarnation of Christ, most ably, philosophically, and in a finished manner handled, you remember, by Dr. Craik, of Kentucky. Here, again, the effect is somewhat the same. Baptism secures the entrance into that living community made alive by the incarnation of Christ.

And so we go on, and then you will observe that in every one of these theories thus far the holder of each theory can, with perfect propriety and assurance, use the language in the baptismal service, which is couched in the form of absolute expression, "This child is regenerate." Is it a change of state? He has come into new relations by virtue of baptism. Is it a germ? He received the germ unknown and unnoticed by man in the act of being baptized. And so throughout. All these theories accept, therefore, the absolute phraseology of the Prayer-Book but one, and all who hold these theories, therefore, rise in embattled opposition against any other theory.

Now, sir, there is another theory. There is a theory that excludes the idea of absolutism. It passes in thought thus: Baptism is a sacrament; a sacrament is a covenant between God and man; a covenant between two parties implies and involves necessarily conditions; the conditions constitute the life of the covenant; the conditions absent, the covenant fails; the conditions present, the covenant is fulfilled. In its essential nature, then, Baptism is a covenant, and if the human part of the conditions fail the Divine Covenant is held by no manner of obligation whatsoever. For His own part He cannot fail; but then He demands fulfilment of the conditions. "Doubt you not, therefore, but earnestly believe that He for His part will favorably receive this child," but then the child must for his part promise, and so on. Conditions, then, they say, make the life of the covenant, and the conditions failing, the covenant fails. There is a principle of common sense. If any man can deny it, let him do so in his own mind.

Now it follows, the grace of baptism being dependent upon conditions, those conditions, not always certified to be present, may cause the failure of the promised grace. In other words, as a general proposition, the grace of the sacrament is by no means necessarily tied to the sacrament, just as Simon Magus after his baptism was still in the bond of iniquity and the gall of bitterness; just as Cornelius before his baptism was a receiver of the Holy Ghost, which constituted him a due recipient of the baptism. So from these facts they prove that the sacrament and the grace are not of necessity connected. If they may be separated at all, they may be separated again and again, and if their separation depends upon the conditions performed or not performed, then we must exclude from our phraseology upon that subject every form of absolute affirmation. There is the ground, then,

of those who hold as the conclusion of their theory this statement. Regeneration may precede the baptismal act; it may occur in the baptismal act; it may follow the baptismal act; but it is by no means by any law of philosophical thinking or of Scripture teaching absolutely tied to the sacramental act itself. You can at once see that those who hold that theory cannot but demur, reluct, and be aggrieved at being obliged to thank God in absolute phrase for a result which they are not by any means sure has taken place. Their theory forbids it. And then the question meets us: Has their theory a right to live? Is there any such theory as theirs accredited in the Church and by the Church? If there be not, then, sir, they must be ruled out of court at once; they have no right to a place among us. Yet, if, on the other hand, the Church herself has warranted and justified such a theory of a constitutional grace in the sacrament, so that the grace may be now, then, or past, we have no right to insist upon their using words which shall express an opposite meaning from that. Now, then, has the Church warranted any such thing?

I call your attention to that decision of the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Protestant Christendom—the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England—in the case very well known as the Gorham case. I know, and you know, with what measure of obloquy the decisions of that court have been greeted here and there in the English Church; you know as well as I know how that court has been disparaged and decried because it was said to be a court of laymen, notwithstanding there were Bishops and Archbishops upon it; and in opposition to it, and in superiority to it, has been advanced the other court, the Court of Arches, with a single layman as the judge. So, whatever we may say of the merits or the demerits, the qualifications or the disqualifications of that court, it stands to-day as the prime authority in every matter of ecclesiastical discussion within this Church as in the bounds of the Church of England. And let me remind you of another thing, that that court, though consisting of laymen, consists of laymen learned in the law, laymen with the very qualifications for doing what they profess to do, namely: interpret the laws of the Church of England, disclaiming at the very outset all ecclesiastical preferences, prejudices, biases, that might lead them to shape a doctrine after their wishes or their traditions, excluding fear, and favor, and affection, and binding themselves to act constantly by the strict rules, acknowledged rules of interpretation which are applicable to secular laws. In the use of that faculty, by that sort of practice, by virtue of fair interpretation, they pronounce the highest judgment, remember, of the Church of England, binding equally upon us, because they judge our standards as well as the standards of the Church, and they declare that the view I have last set forth was a view that is tenable in the Church of England. Now, if a view may lawfully be held in the Church of England, then the language of the Church in her formularies should, of course, be made to correspond to her adjudications.

That is English decision. Let me call your attention to American decree. The Bishops in council, with an extraordinary unanimity, set forth a declaration touching our offices for the baptism of infants in the following words:

"The subscribers, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the said Church, to declare our convictions as to the meaning of the word 'regenerate' in the office for the ministration of Baptism of Infants, do declare that, in our opinion, the word 'regener-

ate' is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of Baptism is wrought in the Sacrament."

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is out.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I move that the reverend doctor have time to finish his speech.

The motion was agreed to *nem. con.*

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Can we ask for higher and more inclusive authority than this? Mark the phraseology. No moral change is certainly determined by the language of the baptismal service, say the House of Bishops—"moral change." The House was nearly or quite unanimous in that declaration. I have heard it suggested that all the Bishops did not understand that "regeneration" signified a moral change. I know not what dictionaries they might use. I know not what psychological views they may, one or another of them, adopt and cherish; but one thing I know, that the Catechism declares the inward grace of baptism to be a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness. And this is the change according, you remember, to the Baptismal service, when it says: "What is the inward part of baptism?" "A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature children of God, we are thereby"—not by baptism, but by this death unto sin—"made the children of God." Now, sir, are not sin and righteousness moral terms? Do they not denote moral qualities and qualifications? If sin and righteousness are to be excluded from the category of moral qualities, it strikes me we have a novel system of theology introduced among us, and we may as well destroy our dictionaries. If sin and righteousness be moral qualities, then a death and crucifixion to the one (sin), and a new living creation to the other (righteousness), must be a moral change; and yet that moral change is not necessarily determined, by the language of the Baptismal Service, to belong to the infant recipient of the baptism.

Now, sir, grounding myself upon this simple demonstration—for a demonstration I claim it to be—I rest my argument upon one point. It is the point of simple fairness, truth, and justice. I maintain that if the Church has admitted, tolerated, and allowed to be held the doctrine that I speak of, in the exposition that I now denote, then, I claim, that the Church has no right to exact of any of her children a form of expression that shall not only stultify, nullify, but falsify her own prime teaching. I claim, therefore, in behalf of these nearly six hundred petitioners that the Church shall be consistent with herself; and I feel strong in this point, for when any man pleads the cause of simple truth and honesty he may feel that his feet are planted on the rock, yea, upon the very rock of ages, which is truth, imperishable truth, and He who sits above it loveth not anything that maketh a lie. Now, sir, you can see at once how clergymen of our Church, who hold the theory that I speak of, holding it as perfectly justifiable, may be aggrieved when they are obliged to use language that contradicts upon the face of it, and in absolute terms, the very theory they are allowed to hold. And we know what reproaches are cast upon them. Some of them omit it from their use of the service, and some of them claim—I will not say "the wish is father to the thought"—that they have a right to omit it, because many of the services of the Church are omitted on system by almost all her clergy. I go, let me say by way of parenthesis, for a literal and absolute construction of the laws of the Church; but nevertheless I can see—and any man, I think, with any largeness of mental discourse can see—how a very conscientious, large-hearted, earnest-minded man who seeks his counsel from direct com-

munion with the Giver of every good and perfect gift, who asks direction for his very soul of souls, I can see and you can see how, when the conflict comes, he should feel bound within himself to prefer, as by a paramount obligation, the truth which is essential, which is of God, rather than the truth which obliges him to bow to a mere conventional regulation expressed by a particular form of words. I do not say that I would do that; but I can have abundant consideration for the man who is so familiar with essential truths that when he comes to the conventionalisms of life they shall seem to him in comparison as of far less obligation, and that we may thus account for these departures from strict Rubrical exactness on the part of some of the clergy which many of us are supposed to reprobate contemptuously, almost hatefully, for some expressions are full of venom, at any rate contemptuously, and charging them with being violators of the truth. Sir, in such a case the falsity is not with them; the falsity is rather with the Church herself, who forces them to the falsity. It is easy to say, "Let them quit our borders; let them go and float abroad." But, sir, they belong to the Church. They have the calling of the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost has put His seal and impress upon their ministry in many notable instances. Whom God hath called, we have no right to turn away from the Church. What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. All that we, calling ourselves the Church, have to do, and which we should rather do, it seems to me, would be abate the grievance, modify the form of the words. What harm is done?

This proposition meets with various manifold objections from all quarters, and, among the rest, is this very one, "Harm is done, because one alteration of the phrase would mean a change in the Church's doctrine." I have never been able to take into my own mind the force of that objection. Alteration of the Church's doctrine! All agree that the Church holds some form of baptismal regeneration. Does this make a change in her doctrine? The sacrament is finished; the grace is bestowed; the child is born again. Whatsoever of benediction or of blessing comes to the recipient of that act is already received, and should the parties turn and go away at that moment they would go with God's benison upon them; they would go in peace. All beyond that is gratuitous, surplusage merely; and is that necessity?

But does not the alternative expression of any opinion or doctrine of the Church involve in any way a denial of it or its opposite? Neither. I speak here with authority. You have only to open your Prayer-Books to find my voucher. Take, if you please, the alternative formula in the ordination service. Are there two meanings there in those two forms? By no means. When the Bishop says, "Take thou authority to preach, to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God," and says no more, does he mean to deny the gift and agency of the Holy Ghost in the execution of that office, any more than if he had said, "Receive the Holy Ghost"? Not at all. The non-expression of one is not a denial of it. Take, if you please, again, the sign of the cross in this very baptism. Take, again, what is called the Evangelical Law at the close of the Decalogue in the ante-communion service. The minister may pass on and pretermitt that law altogether, from year end to year end. Does the Church mean to say thereby that any true son of the Church may hold that the Decalogue, whose scheme and system of outward morality is all that the Church believes in, that there is no recognition by her of that high supernal principle of the new birth which works out in love to God supreme, and love to man impartial?

The omission, then, is not a denial. Take the two

Creeds, if you please. Take first, however, the Apostles' Creed—the descent into hell. The Church allows us an alternative phrase, or it allows its entire omission. Does the Church mean by entire allowance to deny that she holds the doctrine? Take the two Creeds by themselves. A minister may use the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed; and he may use it year in and year out, and he may be a Unitarian in sentiment, and repeat the Apostles' Creed, as any Unitarian will. But does the Church by that allowance mean to deny that she holds the doctrine of the triune personality of the Godhead as the vital truth of the great salvation?

Now, sir, I think these instances are enough to prove that the alteration, the omission, the giving alternative expressions, does by no means involve denial. If this be so, then that objection, I think, is met and satisfied.

We have other forms of objection. We are told that if we begin this alteration, we do not know where we shall end; this is the entering-wedge to a great change. Who told you so? Your brethren in simple, honest trust and faith come and ask you to change that which is to their conscience and souls a grievance. They tell you they ask no more. Now, will you refuse a petition grounded on law, grounded on reasonableness, rooting itself in fraternity—will you refuse that petition because of an apprehension that something worse may come, by and by, from the same quarter? I confess my own impatience whenever I hear this specific objection made to the proposition before us. It sounds like a wail of feebleness. It sounds like the plaint of a weak, indulgent mother, whose only and indulged son comes to her, teasing continually for new and greater benefits; and she feels that with every benefit she gives, every grant she makes, she is only opening the way wider for a larger and a more mischievous indulgence by-and-by. Are we that weak mother? Are we not men who claim the common sense of men? Are we not men to meet here and scrutinize every application, analyze and dissect it to its minutest fibre, its every quality and condition, before we grant it? It is too feeble a reply. I was surprised to hear it from my friend from Pittsburgh yesterday.

We are accustomed sometimes to hear in the newspapers, and sometimes hear it in speeches here, a slur, a taunt cast upon those who ask this favor at your hands, and it takes the form generally of "weak consciences" and "weak brothers." Weak consciences! I have endeavored just now to show that the struggle in the mind of the men who complain of this thing is this: It is the struggle of a strong conscientiousness holding fast by the eternal truth of God, a struggle with the feeble grasp of conventionalism. Sir, let no man make light of conscience in any of its moods or forms. It is God's vicegerent in the soul; it rules from that sway a sceptre, the very vice-regal sceptre of Omnipotence itself. It is God's grand voucher to man of man's own possible affiliation and unity with Him. It is the mouth-piece of the eternal truth, evermore, however misguided, however educated, evermore pointing to the essential distinction between right and wrong. I may pity a scrupulous conscience, but I cannot help loving it. I revere a delicate, sensitive conscience that would rather die than sin, and I pity the lamentations of the man who, when the plea is solemnly urged by a Christian brother of conscientiousness, can taunt him with the very phrase, and turn that sacred term into a mockery and byword. I would not be that man myself. So long as I revere God, I must reverence his auxiliary and representative in the human bosom.

Another objection is this: "These men do not ask

for themselves; they do not all complain of this grievance; they ask for others." Grant it, sir. I stand in that very position myself, and so did every one of the signers of the circular that went forth. But what of that? Will you not respect more the man who comes and pleads for a suffering neighbor, than you will a man who comes with the plea of his own necessity? Will you not give your respectful hearing more to a crowd of clergymen, you, our brethren, who come here to plead with you for pity's sake, for fraternity's sake, to listen to the call of the other, your brethren as well as their brethren? Certainly, sir, instead of weakening the application, this consideration, I think, strengthens it immensely. They plead not for themselves, but they plead for those who need, who suffer, who are ready to weep.

I do not know of any other special objection that I need review just now, Mr. President. I think I feel strong enough in the simple conviction I have expressed that I plead for simple, pure truth. I stand grounded, I am sure, in this appeal in perfect righteousness of demand. I might dwell upon the great expediency of granting this application. I might point out the possible perils of the Church. This is no panic legislation, as it has been called, that you are summoned to. "Panic!" It has been before the Church for years, appeal after appeal, and meeting only with such audiences as might well discourage any other appeal. But when I was asked whether I would sign this petition and send it abroad, I said with all my heart, "Yes, for it is the very least thing we can ask of the Church, for if she will not grant this she will not grant anything." It is a proper test question of our accessibility to the claims of justice and truth. It is a just claim; it is the least claim that could be made. And when I was asked in the second place, "Do you suppose it will be granted?" I just as unhesitatingly and promptly said: "I do not believe it. From all my knowledge of the antecedents of the General Convention, I have no idea that they will grant it; but let the fault be theirs, and not ours. I will do the work; I will be one of the signers; I will, if necessary, and accident or Providence calls for it, be one of the champions for the cause in the General Convention." For my own petition, so to speak, the list that I introduced here, I happened—I believe, I will not say, to be the only one here who signed it, but the only one here of those who started it; and therefore it falls to me, by accident, to introduce it and to advocate it. I do so.

Although we may not be guilty of panic legislation, it is well enough for us to look at the signs of the times. We may exhaust the patience of those who ought to be near and dear to us; and the time may come when some, feeling that they have no hope in this respect, and feeling the weariness of soul that comes from this struggle between essential truth and conventional obligation, will at last perhaps be wearied out; they may depart. We cannot lose them. We ought not to lose them. I wish I had in my hand at this moment the letter of Canon Liddon to Sir John Coleridge, when he speaks of the Ritualists, or at least those of his party being excluded from the Church of England, or not excluded but going out in voluntary secession, and then speaks in the same connection of what is called the Evangelical party in the Church of England in which he frankly and tenderly says that the Church can by no means spare them, that they have been of too much value, that they have in the missionary work been prime movers; in the work of the Church's Hymnody they have furnished the richest material; in the animation and energy of Church work they gave the first grand impulse to the Church.

Now, sir, change the name, and the tale may be told of those in this country of the same class. The

missionary cause is indebted for its origin and its first strong support and impulse to that same class of churchmen; your missionary treasures are in a great measure to-day filled with the liberality of those who represent that same system of thought; they are among the most devoted and energetic of the Church. In saying this I would not disparage those great works of labor and of love and of faith which characterize the very opposite party in the Church, but I will say that for spirituality, for energy, for an elevated strain and standard of piety and godly living, for large liberality to the cause of Christ, this Church of ours is largely indebted to them for her present condition of thrift and grace. No man here will wish to deny that postulate; and, taking it as accepted, I say we cannot afford to lose them; and if they go they must go to swell the ranks of another system, risen up like a mushroom—risen up, you say, without authority, but, nevertheless, standing forth with just as true and absolute authority of apostolicity as this Church itself, with Bishops consecrated even as our Archbishop Parker was by Bishops out of place. ["No, no."] Very well; I take it back; I take it back, though only for the nonce. [Laughter.] It is a question to be discussed in private with my friends. Nevertheless, be that as it may, one friend who says "no, no," does not deny the validity of that ordination. That being the case, there is the acorn of a large, thrifty, wide-spreading Church. Shall it supplant ours? Never, if this Church is true to her heritage and her vows. But still, "a prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself." If it be desirable to save this large class of men; if they whom so many are accustomed to speak of with so much of contempt are, nevertheless, in our mature, and deliberate, and cold-blooded judgments, worthy of being kept among us, is it not worthy of us to listen to their claims to answer their appeal?

Sir, I have intimated once, and said plainly again that I expected this measure to fail. I do expect it to fail. I feel as if I were now singing the requiem over the grave of this petition, but I know—

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. Speak for yourself.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Very well, sir, I speak for myself; but I know, that in pronouncing this, which may be a funeral oration, I bury a corpse that has with it the principle of vitality and resurrection powers. It will rise again, and the Church shall meet it, and in better moods; if not now, she will one day grant it. It is the destiny of truth:

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers."

So, then, I believe there is a resurrection power in this truth, and though you may reject these petitioners, term after term, yet remember. When William Wilberforce introduced the question of the abolition of the slave-trade into the British Parliament, he was hooted, he was crowed at in the insignificant way of those wise legislators; he was called "the pious member"; he was shunned in social life; everybody avoided him; and he was refused. But, again and again, year after year, Parliament after Parliament, the appeal was brought in and again killed, and again brought in and killed again, until at last a change went on in the public sentiment of Great Britain until the appeal prevailed, and Wilberforce became the man of the nation, and every Englishman was proud to have been a friend of Wilberforce and Emancipation. I look to the same result here. I care not if this appeal be dead and buried. I say again, the truth that is in it shall make it arise and live and act powerfully upon you. One of these days,

when the barriers that have hitherto obstructed the free flow of fraternal feeling among us shall be broken down, when the flood gates are opened, and the amalgamation of parties, of which there are such beautiful and refreshing tokens, shall have matured and ripened into fact; then, sir, when the spirit of Divine sonship and of holy fraternity shall fill the looms of churchmen, each man will be glad to grant the poor privilege of a change in a few words of a Rubric, each man will be glad to take by the hand the men whom he has admitted among us, each man will be glad to have given his voice for that highest, noblest, sacredest privilege of a churchman and a Christian—freedom of conscience.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish to ask the gentleman whether we are to understand that the five hundred memorialists are not afflicted in their own consciences in the use of this service?

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I thought I noticed that.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I wished to know what idea you had as to the proposition of men who are afflicted in the use of this service, for I think it affects the whole question.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I cannot say. I know from information that there are a great many. Perhaps my friend from Virginia may give you information on that point, if the Chair will give him the floor for a moment.

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. If I may be allowed to answer that question, I will say this: I cannot, of course, tell, because I do not know all the names; but I know of a very considerable portion of those who come from the part of the Church where I live that are of that class. They have told me for years past that they were pained every time they used the service. They explained and explained it until at last all explanation was quite impossible. I know some on that card, and one hundred and forty clergymen on another paper, of whom more than half, at least, are of that class.

Rev. Dr. BRECK, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish to say that, with all my experience, I have never met, in the Dioceses of Ohio and Pennsylvania and Delaware, with ten men who were afflicted in the use of this service. I have heard now and then individuals say just what the distinguished Deputy has said—that he does not ask it for himself, but he asks it for brethren. I believe that there is a great deal of this feeling in these memorials, for many of the Deputies may remember a memorial was brought into the Convention in 1868, which was prepared in the city of New York and sent to each Diocese to get signatures, declaring that the whole Church was distracted, and each Diocese was to say that the Diocese was distracted from one end to the other. This was sent to Delaware, where we were in perfect harmony, where there was no distraction, and yet this was circulated and signed there and brought into the Convention as proof of the distracted state of the Church! I believe that if these five hundred memorialists were to-day to march up this aisle and could each one be catechised as to the difficulty that he undergoes in using the baptismal service, there would not be fifty men out of five hundred who would say that they could conscientiously use it at all. Instead of its being the impressive memorial of a large body, one-sixth of the clergy of the Church, it dwindles down to a very small number, and I believe that if the gentlemen who bring forward this matter would only instruct their brethren who are afflicted in this way, this memorial would not come to us, and this matter would be quieted down.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Mr. President and gentlemen, it is, I must say, with a good deal of

hesitation that I stand up to speak in behalf of the doctrine of the Prayer-Book—

Rev. Dr. ANDREWS, of Virginia. Will the doctor allow me a moment, as I shall not be here perhaps at the proper time. A very important misstatement, if I may so call it, was made yesterday, which may have an important effect on this question; and that is, it was stated here by the Deputy from Pittsburgh that it required the approval of two General Conventions to change a Rubric. Such is not the fact. It requires that it be only proposed at one General Convention and acted upon at the next.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. May I ask a question, in that immediate connection, with Dr. Adams' consent?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I do not see why a discussion should be interpolated in the time given me.

The PRESIDENT. Dr. Adams will go on.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I hope this House will give me a little time further, if I do not succeed in putting what I have to say within the limits appointed. I say it is with a great deal of hesitation that I stand up to speak before this venerable assembly of clergy and laity upon a subject so important as this. It is simply because I know that the two ablest and best minds of the House are upon the contrary side. My dear old friend from Virginia I calculate to be the ablest politician and shrewdest engineer that ever acted on the floor of this House. [Laughter.] It is interesting to me to see how opponents shudder when he comes on the floor. They know he means business. And as to the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts, he has an air of graciousness and of dignity and of sweetness about him which, if anything could convince one of the soundness of the argument he has adopted, would certainly do it. Therefore, Mr. President, I have a great deal of hesitation in speaking upon this matter. Still at the same time I hope I may be able to go down to the shrewd, hard common sense of the Church on this matter.

The first thing I would suggest to the gentlemen of this House is, that a great drag-net has been cast out by those two able men to carry into its folds all men who, for any reason whatever, are sore upon the subject of baptismal regeneration; or, I should say more properly, regeneration in baptism. This drag-net, managed by these fishers of men, for I must truly say they are so, has been able to bring up five hundred men, clergymen of our Church, who for one reason or another have objected to this baptismal service, and are seeking to obtain a relaxation of it. I hold to statistics in the strongest way, and I say that our two brothers have succeeded in convincing the clergy and laity of the Church that five-sixths of our clergy have no objection whatsoever to the baptismal service, and no desire for any relaxation whatsoever. That, I think, is an argument that they never calculated upon when they undertook this alteration, but so be it, five-sixths of all the clergymen of the Church are perfectly content with the doctrines of the Prayer-Book, and the practice and principle that has been handed down to us by our ancestors.

Now, Mr. President, I have a good many points in this argument that I am going to bring forth to you. One of the Bishops of the English Church, with whom I have been acquainted for many years, and who does me the honor of corresponding with me, was writing to me in regard to the composition of this House; it was Dr. Moberley, Bishop of Salisbury, who calls me his "Dear friend," and whom I think worthy of being the friend of any man in this House. He wrote me in regard to the composition of this House, and I answered him: "Bishop, the laity in the House of Deputies of the General

Convention are not a disorderly mass, but they are the most conservative men of the Church." "What is the reason for that?" he enquired; I answered, because in the House of General Convention we have so many men that have done the work of judges in the United States courts or in our State courts, and therefore these men and that judicial influence balance completely the tendency of the laity to irregularity or to excitement. He wrote me back again that in his Synod he had found the same thing also. Now, Mr. President, to the legal element in this Convention, to the judicial element, also, and to the clergy of our Church, who are not to be carried away by excitement, but have that temper which is the temper of the English Church—the legal temper—I wish to address one argument, or one branch of my argument, in reference to this question.

This dispute has been a very long-continued dispute. We have had legal trials upon it. That Bishop of irregular ordination who is now lying loose about in the West, and East, and all about [laughter]—Bishop Cheney—was once brought to trial by one of the greatest legal minds in the Church, and what was it for? It was for exercising of his own accord this very privilege which my distinguished friends come here and propose to us to give by Canon to every clergyman of the Church. That is to say, Cheney was under the law of the Church brought up for trial for omitting the very words which our distinguished friend claims should be omitted here, and he was condemned for it; he was in his contumacy degraded for it. He is now a Bishop, wandering about, consecrated by Bishop Cummins. I would ask the legal gentlemen of this House, What is the effect of this proposed amendment? It is simply to make us reverse that verdict. Now, we have no judicial rights whatever, but simply legislative. But my equally distinguished brother from Massachusetts and my equally distinguished brother from Virginia come up, and are for this House passing a Canon, or an amendment, or a Rubric, on this subject. Suppose we go according to the recommendation of our Committee on Canons, and what do we do? We pass it. The gentleman from Virginia has never told us of its effect; the gentleman from Massachusetts has never told us of its effect. What does the man who is a Cheneyite in Illinois or Wisconsin say? "Why, you acted unjustly; you deposed poor Cheney, our present Bishop, because on Christian grounds, grounds of conscience, honest and true and heavenly-minded, he omitted a single word. Now you, as a General Convention, authorize all to omit it."

Mr. President, I think that my brother from Virginia is very shrewd; I think that my brother from Massachusetts is exceedingly able; but it is my opinion that such a proposition as this will not be passed by this House, that the distinguished lawyers and distinguished judges whom I see here will never suffer this House of General Convention to stultify themselves by such an absurd action. I know and am old enough to have known how Evans and Chambers and Chief Justice Jones moved the Church. If we had a Methodist assembly or a Roman Catholic assembly, we could not have had them. When they look at the effect of this in a legal point of view, such men will not be willing to let us go into such a den of mud as this.

Now, having spoken of this matter, I will speak of another, and I hope, if I am tedious, that the House will put me down; if I am not tedious, and talk a little common sense, and go down to the hard bed-rock, I hope they will give me time enough to say what I have to say. I go now to the question of conscience. With regard to this matter of conscience, I would say—first, that no mortal man

has ever known that I would sneer or slur at any conscience whatsoever. I trust it is not in the Christian feeling of any one to do so. I therefore put that thing aside. I am willing to acknowledge that Torquemada and Arbues, the inquisitors of old, were conscientious men; I am also fully convinced that Ignatius Loyola was a very conscientious man, and I respect their conscience. If I had been in their condition under the same circumstances, I dare say I might conscientiously have done the same as they did. But conscience is not God; conscience is the faculty of us weak and frail human beings. Conscience may be diseased, as the eye may be diseased or the ear may be diseased; and, therefore, in listening to the voice of God, my conscience may not leave my mind in perfect repose; my mind may see but dimly the light of the glory which God intends to cast on the soul of every human being. There may be such a thing as a diseased conscience.

Again, conscience, in addition to being diseased, may be uninstructed. An ignorant conscience is the worst of all consciences. I have no doubt that the savage Indian, when he torments his miserable victim, is under the influence of an uninstructed conscience. I am not going, therefore, to tax myself on that ground. I am going to say that I respect every conscience that is sound, and that is well instructed, and none else, and I believe the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts would agree with me in this.

Now I want to follow this matter out. Here are five hundred gentlemen that appeal to us, clergy of the Church, for the insertion of a Rubric and a change in the Prayer-Book, which *bona fide* and actually destroys our doctrine, for it is neither more nor less than this. They appeal to us because their conscience is violated. May it not be that the conscience in these cases is a diseased conscience; that it results from a morbid state of feeling that this appeal is made? May it not be that it is an uninstructed conscience? I think it may so be, because I know full well that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who makes this appeal in behalf of the consciences of these gentlemen, has never felt any scruples upon it himself. He has used the two prayers which are objected to in the service from the beginning of his ministerial life until now. I remember happily a young gentleman whom I assisted in training for the ministry, who told me what brought him into the Church. He said that what taught him the doctrine of regeneration in baptism was that when he was in Boston he went into Dr. Vinton's Sunday-school, and there, said he, "I saw in his catechism that in baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven; and that, Dr. Adams, was the first thing that got the regeneration in baptism into my head." I think it possible that there may be in these men a morbid conscience, that there may be a want of instruction in conscience, and that they may come up to us under these false motives.

But I would say something more in reference to this matter of conscience, and I hope it will be attended to. These men at twenty-one years of age, or at twenty-three, solemnly accepted the Prayer-Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and as solemnly promised to believe its doctrines and conform to its teachings. Now, when a full-grown man, an educated man of three and twenty years of age, whose thought has been directed to the study of the Scriptures and to the study of dogma, has signed that document in the full maturity of his mind and as the completion of his system of theology, it seems to me that, at this late day, it is rather a poor thing to come up and say,

"My conscience is too weak to be bound on this subject; I demand relaxation; I demand an alteration of the Prayer-Book, so that my conscience may be relieved." I take it for granted that in the case of the mass of these men, it is rather a feeble and diseased conscience, or it is a conscience uninstructed; and therefore I, as a High Churchman, say go to the Prayer-Book, go to the Bible, and if you find any difficulty with regard to the matter, settle it there. But in order that my distinguished brother from Massachusetts and my equally distinguished brother from Virginia may know the proper course in which we High Churchmen deal with this matter, I will state a case that came before myself in which a clergyman had a doubt in regard to the doctrine of the Church on the Holy Trinity; and what did I do in regard to that man? I told him: "Mr. So-and-so, your conscience is weak; you are therefore in doubt as to your duty before God in using the Prayer-Book. Your duty is not to leave the Church; your duty is solemnly and before God to withdraw from the use of that Book for a certain length of time and from the exercise of your ministry; pray and study with all your heart and soul until you find out that which is right, and then if you find according to your judgment after all this study, prayerfully directed, that you are wrong in using that Book, withdraw from the Church whose manual it is." That is the way to deal with these gentlemen. Their business, if they hesitate about the Prayer-Book, is to go solemnly to the Bishop, tell him that they hesitate about its use, withdraw from its use for a certain time; and then if being instructed fully they are convinced of the difficulty which we hear of to-day, let them withdraw from the Church, and God's blessing will go with them. But the idea of coming here and making this excitement is not what an honest, instructed conscience would do in the present state of the Church.

Mr. President, I have a few things more to say. In the English Church there have always been Calvinistic clergy. Did the English Church ever put its Calvinistic clergy out? Not a bit. Calvinistic clergy in the English Church profess precisely the doctrine that my reverend friend from Massachusetts has brought forward in his speech.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I move that the doctor be allowed to go on.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Calvinistic clergy, that is to say clergy holding the doctrine upon predestination of the great St. Augustine, have always been permitted to live in the English Church, and enjoy livings, and even Bishoprics; and in this Church the thing has been the same. Some of my best friends in the ministry have been men who professed the Calvinistic doctrine to the extreme, men who believed in absolute predestination. And who were these Calvinistic clergy? There was the great Bishop Davenant, a thorough Calvinist. Many of them are in the Church of England and many in ours. My brother from Virginia knows that there have been among that number of men holy and good men, both in past ages and in the age to which he belongs, and I almost; that is to say, Venn, Simeon, Newton, and Cecil. These men have been tolerated and recognized as leaders of religious thought in that Church. Now, I would ask one question: Did any one of those men ever hesitate to use this baptismal service? Not one. They did not go to the metaphysics of the thing as displayed before you this day, very learned and able metaphysics about the six or seven different ways of interpreting the baptismal service, which I heard with a great deal of interest,

Venn, Simeon, Newton, and Cecil, each of these men used that Prayer-Book, used those two prayers that are objected to, never made any complaint in their lives. I understand my friend from Virginia has always been accounted Evangelical, and so recognized by everybody. I do not really see why he should object to the course of proceeding which his brother Evangelicals in the Church of England have pursued for all this time. I do not see why he should come up and appeal for freedom for these men. I think they had better go back and study the Prayer-Book, do as I have suggested, and show some degree of the robust common-sense of the great spiritual stature that belongs to my friend from Virginia.

I say, then, that I do not believe there is any necessity at all for the passing of these resolutions. And now I come to another matter. I am, as is well known, an old High Churchman. I do not profess to be broad, or narrow, or long, or anything of the kind, but an old High Churchman. I go on, therefore, to another argument in this cause. The proposed relation of these Rubrics is, after all, to me a matter of doubtfulness; that is to say, I recognize two schools of thought in the religious world at the present time, the thought that belongs to me, and to the Prayer-Book, and to my brethren, that is to say, that the Holy Spirit sends forth men into this world to preach conversion to the Church, faith in God, and then that self-same Holy Spirit has always, in this world, a Church of Christ. That is my doctrine, and that, I think, is the doctrine of the Church. Holding that doctrine, I believe that we are converted by the influence of the Holy Spirit; that then being converted, we can go forward and be brought into the Church of Christ by that self-same Holy Spirit, and be made, as is said in our Catechism, heirs of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. There is another system, and that is the system of the so-called orthodox sects around us, the system which has been distinctly professed upon the floor by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, that is to say, a system that at any time before, or after, or during baptism, from the beginning of the life of the man, to the end, the Holy Spirit can go forth and comfort him, and he is then and there regenerated. That system, mark you, was taken up by John Calvin and was the system of Calvinistic Christianity. The doctrine has passed away very much, and the system is left merely in the shape in which the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has professed it. I take it that it is not the system of the Church, but at the same time I myself respect those who profess that system. It is a poor system and a weak system, and you can see the difficulty. A person professing that system does not believe in regeneration in baptism, does not believe in the sacraments, believes in nothing but conversion; that is to say, he believes in his own ideas. I have met that system at the West and seen it express itself in this way: "What is the use of baptism? Is it not the living faith that regenerates a man? What is the use of the sacraments?" That system logically and distinctly gets rid of all sacramental ordinances and sacramental influences whatsoever.

I went out to Wisconsin under Bishop Kemper. I never have had any difficulty with my Baptist brethren or any other brethren. Why? They say, "We know what you mean, we know your opinions." I tell them in Baptism we are made members of Christ's Church, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. There is no difficulty or doubt about it. They understand what I mean, and they ask the reason, and I have no

trouble on the point. My friend from Virginia has told of confusion and trouble that divers and sundry good men have had with Baptists and others on this subject. I say I have had no confusion. No man who holds the doctrine of the Church in regard to the sacraments need have any confusion whatsoever with Baptists, Methodists, or any one else, simply because we put ourselves at once upon the ground, "This is the doctrine of the Church: in my baptism I am made a member of Christ, a child of God, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, and you hold by conversion coming at any time you please, when a man begins life, when he is in the middle of life, when he is at the end of it, his conversion may come." I have been accustomed to say to them, "If you want confusion, infidelity, uncertainty, put yourself on that system; but if you believe in the Holy Spirit—believe in its influence here upon earth—you must fully concede, as He has said so, that the gift of regeneration may be attached to the humble Christian acceptance of the sacrament of the baptism." That is my faith, and in that faith I find no difficulty.

I would add one thing more. My brother from Virginia spoke thus:

"One of the greatest minds in the country left our ministry solely on account of the Baptismal Office, as I had it from his own mouth, and confirmed by Bishop McIlvaine, who displaced him."

That is perfectly and entirely true. He did so; and why did he do so? He had written a book, which book is called *Theodicy*. That book in its essential elements is simply and entirely the doctrine of that old philosopher Pelagius, who denied original sin and grace in an early century. That a distinguished gentleman of great mind should leave the Church because of that would naturally be expected, for such I know is the meaning of that book of his; and here I would say I know not the man personally, but I have read his book, and I know that his method of vindicating the ways of God to man is simply that.

The PRESIDENT. Will the gentleman give way to allow the reception of messages from the House of Bishops?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Certainly.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 76) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had concurred in Message No. 67 from the House of Deputies, relating to the Joint Committee on the French Prayer-Book; in Message No. 69, relating to the Joint Committee on the Spanish Prayer-Book; in Message No. 70, relating to the New York Bible and Common Prayer-Book Society; and in Message No. 71, electing trustees of the fund for the relief of widows and orphans of deceased clergymen.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A message (No. 77) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had concurred in Message No. 68 from the House of Deputies, relating to a commission concerning the number of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, with the following amendment to the resolution: Strike out the words "Have an interest in the Seminary," so that the sentence will read, "Said Commission having power to confer with the several Dioceses, and to take such other action as may be necessary."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that we concur in that amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CANON ON RITUAL.

A message (No. 78) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That instead of the section as passed by the House of Deputies, and proposed to be amended by the House of Bishops, the following additional section be added to Canon 20, Title I., 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer,' [being in the same words as the report made this morning by Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh.]

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Allow me to ask whether that is in precise accordance with the report of the Joint Committee of Conference?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I understand it to be exactly as proposed by the Committee of Conference. I, therefore, move that we concur with the action of the House of Bishops, and ask that the vote be taken as soon as the present speaker has concluded his speech.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. In that case, the Diocese of Alabama calls for a division by orders.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. This motion does not say how the vote shall be taken, but leaves it open.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the House concur in the message just sent by the House of Bishops, and that the vote be taken as soon as Dr. Adams has concluded.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I made two motions. In the first place I moved to concur, and then I moved secondly that we take the vote upon that motion to concur as soon as the present speech is finished. Now, will the Chair please put the question on the last motion?

The PRESIDENT. That is the question I propose to put. It is moved that the vote be taken on the motion to concur, immediately after the conclusion of Rev. Dr. Adams's speech.

The motion was agreed to.

OFFICE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions reported by the Committee on Canons in regard to the Baptismal Office are before the House.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Our baptismal office contains the doctrine of the incarnation of Christ; it contains the doctrine of the crucifixion; it contains the doctrine of the Holy Spirit of God in this world so as to regenerate the soul spiritually; it contains all the doctrines of Christianity which are most important to practical morality, to spiritual growth and holiness, and therefore for myself I am against touching the doctrine of regeneration in baptism as it is in our Prayer-Book.

I would say one thing more, and to my friends of the legal profession I think it will be important. Any one who goes upon that definite system to which I have alluded brings up the words of our Lord; he shuts out any interpretation that does away with them, and he says, "That is the Scriptural doctrine." Now we stand upon the doctrine, and I wish to my legal friends in this House, and to those who have a legal mind, to put forward the fact that for twelve hundred years after Christ in the Church the text, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of heaven," was referred to nothing else than to baptism. That challenge was brought forward by Hooker three hundred years ago. It is renewed by Alford and the most eminent clergymen of our Church. It is acknowledged by the Lutheran divines. I think this ought to be conclusive that the doctrine of regeneration is the doctrine of the Church.

One thing more I will say, and it is a critical remark in regard to the gentleman who preceded me. He said that the Unitarians could use the Apostles' Creed. If the Unitarian can believe in "Jesus Christ, his only Son," and assert that Christ

is the only Son of God, be it so; but I say no Unitarian can use the Apostles' Creed, for no Unitarian can honestly believe that Christ our Lord is the only Son of God.

Now I have one or two remarks more to make. This gentleman appealed to our blunder with regard to "the descent into hell." I say "our blunder;" that is to say, the blunder of our Church; and a very stupid blunder it was. It was because the Church in the United States in revising her Prayer-Book simply gave permission to omit a whole article of the Apostles' Creed, and the same Church comes in and in the Confirmation Service brings a man forward to that Church and says, "You believe in all the articles of the Apostles' Creed?" It was a most extraordinary blunder. She brings a man up to be confirmed on the ground of his belief in all the Articles when she has permitted him to omit one. I do not believe in the infallibility of this Church. I believe, as my Mother Church of England has believed, that national and particular churches may err; the Churches of Rome and of Antioch have erred; and also she admits the possibility of a mistake on the part of the Church of England. I believe this Church has made a blunder in that respect. Both my distinguished friends have appealed to that blunder. As we blundered in reference to the Apostles' Creed, as we made a mistake there, therefore, say they, blunder in regard to this! I hope that this Convention will make no such mistake. That is the argument. I am not sufficiently a logician to state it, but the argument that two blunders make a thing right will hardly be adopted by this Convention!

I thank this House most sincerely for being willing to hear me. These American people are inclined to politics. Everybody knows it, and I think it is a benevolent tendency. I believe very much in parties in the State. I do not believe in parties in the Church. What do you do if you pass this? You simply organize these five hundred gentlemen into a party, the famous five hundred. I wish I knew all the names of the famous five hundred, who, if this motion of these two distinguished gentlemen passes, will have the liberty of omitting the exhortation preceding the Lord's Prayer, and also omitting the Thanksgiving following it. They will be that party, and then the mass of the Church will be the other party. I do object, most sincerely and earnestly, to this Convention going into the organizing of any such party by the passing of these resolutions.

And with regard to this matter I end, as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts began. He came to bury these resolutions. I am glad that he felt that they were dead. Unquestionably they are dead, and I hope that no vote of this House will try to galvanize them and restore them to a life, which life, if it is given to them, will deny the truth of the Gospel, will uphold Bishop Cheney, will destroy all the practical effect, and it is great, of our doctrine of baptism upon our wives; our children, and ourselves, and will organize a party, which party will give trouble from end to end in this Church.

I have only to thank yourself, Mr. President, and gentlemen, for the patience with which you have been willing to hear these remarks, and to say that from my heart and soul I fully and entirely believe in the Prayer-Book in all respects, and I will not see it changed in any way.

CANON ON RITUAL.

The PRESIDENT. By the order of the House the vote is now to be taken on concurring in the message of the House of Bishops upon the additional sections to Canon 20 of Title I., being the sections

on Ritual as reported by the Committee of Conference of the two Houses.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. The Diocese of Albany asks that the question be taken by Dioceses and orders, and for this simple reason: We have had serious doubts of the constitutionality of the Canon proposed, partly because it provides legislation for Ritual by Canon and—

The PRESIDENT. I do not think the question can be argued.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. I am not going to argue the question. I wish to explain my vote.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. There are many others in the House who would like to have an opportunity of explaining their votes.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. The other day, sir— ["Order, order!"]

Mr. STEPHENS, of Tennessee. If the gentleman can explain his vote, there are three hundred others here who will have that right.

The PRESIDENT. Gentlemen must see that this thing cannot be continued.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I ask general consent to make one remark. ["Question, question!"]

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. Will the Secretary read distinctly those parts that have been restored by the Committee of Conference?

The PRESIDENT. He will read the whole distinctly.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I want attention called particularly to those parts.

The SECRETARY. The resolution to be voted on is as follows:

"Resolved, That instead of the section as passed by the House of Deputies, and proposed to be amended by the House of Bishops, the following additional section be added to Canon 20, of Title I., 'Of the Use of the Book of Common Prayer.'

"Sec. 2. [1.] If any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made to him in writing, by two or more of his Presbyters, that within his jurisdiction ceremonies or practices not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced by any minister during the celebration of the Holy Communion (such as

"a. The elevation of the elements in the Holy Communion in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made;

"b. Any act of adoration of or towards the elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections; and

"c. All other like acts, not authorized or allowed by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.)

"It shall be the duty of such Bishop to summon the Standing Committee as his council of advice, and with them to investigate the matter.

"[2.] If after investigation it shall appear to the Bishop and the Standing Committee that ceremonies and practices not ordained or authorized as aforesaid, and setting forth or symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have, in fact, been introduced as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, by instrument of writing, under his hand, to admonish the minister so offending to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if the minister shall disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Provided, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the presentment, trial, and punishment of any minister under the provisions of Section 1, of Canon 2, Title II., of the Digest.

"[3.] In all investigations under the provisions of this Canon the minister whose acts or practices are the subject-matter of the investigation shall be notified and have opportunity to be heard in his defence. The charges preferred and the findings of the Bishop and Standing Committee shall be in writing, and a record shall be kept of the proceedings in the case."

The Secretary announced the result of the vote as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE—41 Dioceses represented; ayes 38, noes 2, divided 1.

LAY VOTE—81 Dioceses represented; ayes 28, noes 1, divided 2.

The vote in detail is as follows:

CLERGY.

Alabama.—Rev. Dr. Banister, Rev. Dr. Stringfellow, and Rev. Dr. Fulton, aye.

Albany.—Rev. Dr. Payne, Rev. Dr. Tucker, and Rev. Dr. Brown, nay.

Arkansas.—Rev. Mr. Trimble and Rev. Mr. Bruce, aye.

California.—Rev. Mr. Birdsall, Rev. Mr. Chetwood, Rev. Mr. Easton, and Rev. Mr. Githens, aye.

Central New York.—Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, Rev. Dr. Wilson, and Rev. Mr. Hitchcock, aye. Rev. Dr. Ayrault, nay.

Central Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Paret, Rev. Dr. Breck, Rev. Mr. Marple, Rev. Mr. Leverett, aye.

Connecticut.—Rev. Dr. Meade, Rev. Dr. Beardsley, Rev. Mr. Johnson, and Rev. Dr. Clark, aye.

Delaware.—Rev. Mr. Spencer, Rev. Mr. Stone, and Rev. Mr. Douglass, aye.

Easton.—Rev. Mr. Barber, Rev. Dr. Stearns, Rev. Dr. Crosdale, and Rev. Dr. Fulton, aye.

Florida.—Rev. Mr. Thackara, aye.

Georgia.—Rev. Mr. Rees, Rev. Mr. Clarke, Rev. Dr. Williams, and Rev. Dr. Benedict, aye.

Illinois.—Rev. Dr. Chase, Rev. Dr. Corbett, and Rev. Mr. Gregg, aye. Rev. Mr. Knowles, nay.

Indiana.—Rev. Mr. Roberts and Rev. Mr. Dunham, nay.

Iowa.—Rev. Mr. McIlwain and Rev. Mr. Goodhue, aye.

Kansas.—Rev. Dr. Reynolds, Rev. Mr. Bakewell, and Rev. Mr. Beatty, aye.

Kentucky.—Rev. Dr. Craik, Rev. Dr. Perkins, and Rev. Mr. Shipman, aye.

Long Island.—Rev. Dr. Hall, Rev. Dr. Schenck, Rev. Dr. Diller, and Rev. Dr. Haskins, aye.

Louisiana.—Rev. Mr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Girault, Rev. Mr. Harris, and Rev. Dr. Dalzell, aye.

Maine.—Rev. Mr. Leffingwell, Rev. Mr. Upjohn, Rev. Mr. Ward, and Rev. Dr. Pise, aye.

Maryland.—Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. Dr. Ewin, Rev. Dr. Leeds, and Rev. Dr. Dudley, aye.

Massachusetts.—Rev. Dr. Vinton, Rev. Dr. Huntington, Rev. Dr. Burgess, and Rev. Dr. Lambert, —

Michigan.—Rev. Mr. Gillespie, Rev. Mr. Brown, Rev. Mr. Earp, and Rev. Mr. Worthington, aye.

Minnesota.—Rev. Dr. Masters, Rev. Dr. Kidney, and Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker, aye.

Mississippi.—Rev. Dr. Crane, Rev. Dr. Sansom, Rev. Mr. Douglas, and Rev. Mr. Marks, aye.

Missouri.—Rev. Dr. Runcie, Rev. Dr. Berkley, and Rev. Mr. Jennings, aye.

Nebraska.—Rev. Mr. Shaw and Rev. Mr. Talbot, aye.

New Hampshire.—Rev. Dr. Hubbard and Rev. Dr. Herrick, aye.

New Jersey.—Rev. Dr. Farrington, Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, and Rev. Dr. Clark, aye.

New York.—Rev. Dr. Cooke, Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Dr. Cady, and Rev. Dr. Geer, aye.

North Carolina.—Rev. Dr. Watson, Rev. Dr. Smedes, Rev. Mr. Huske, and Rev. Dr. Buxton, aye.

Ohio.—Rev. Dr. Burr and Rev. Dr. Boyd, aye.

Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Rudder, Rev. Mr. Bolton, and Rev. Dr. Davies, aye.

Pittsburgh.—Rev. Dr. Scarborough, Rev. Mr. Getz, Rev. Mr. Smith, and Rev. Dr. Spalding, aye.

Rhode Island.—Rev. Mr. Locke, aye.

South Carolina.—Rev. Mr. Pinckney, Rev. Mr. Porter, and Rev. Mr. McCullough, aye.

Tennessee.—Rev. Mr. Gray, Rev. Dr. Harrison, and Rev. Dr. Beckett, aye.

Texas.—Rev. Mr. Rogers, Rev. Mr. Richardson, and Rev. Mr. Davenport, aye.

Vermont.—Rev. Dr. Douglass, Rev. Mr. Bliss, Rev. Mr. Putnam, and Rev. Mr. Atwill, aye.

Virginia.—Rev. Dr. Andrews, Rev. Mr. Hanckel, and Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, aye.

Western New York.—Rev. Dr. Shelton, Rev. Dr. Foote, Rev. Dr. Rankine, and Rev. Mr. Mann, aye.

Wisconsin.—Rev. Dr. Adams and Rev. Mr. Haft, aye. Rev. Dr. De Koven, nay.

LAITY.

Albany.—Mr. Meads and Mr. Forsyth, nay.

California.—Mr. Webb and Mr. Walsh, aye.

Central New York.—Mr. Chedell, Mr. McWhorter, and Mr. Clark, aye.

Central Pennsylvania.—Mr. Coppé, Mr. Lamber-ton, and Mr. Rockwell, aye.

Connecticut.—Mr. Stark and Mr. Robertson, aye.

Delaware.—Mr. Fell, aye.

Easton.—Mr. Goldsborough, aye.

Georgia.—Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Whittle, and Mr. Montgomery, aye.

Illinois.—Mr. Otis, aye.

Iowa.—Mr. Daymude, aye.

Kansas.—Mr. Bartholow, aye.

Kentucky.—Mr. Stevenson, aye.

Long Island.—Mr. Pierrepont, Mr. King, and Mr. Nichol, aye.

Louisiana.—Mr. Race and Mr. Biscoe, aye.

Maine.—Mr. Bridge and Mr. Gardiner, aye.

Maryland.—Mr. Blair, aye.

Massachusetts.—Mr. Mason, aye. Mr. Shattuck, nay.

Michigan.—Mr. Trowbridge, aye.

Minnesota.—Mr. Wilder, aye.

Missouri.—Mr. Douglass, aye.

New Jersey.—Mr. Garthwaite and Mr. Mills, aye.

New York.—Mr. Ruggles and Mr. Livingston, aye.

North Carolina.—Mr. De Rosset and Mr. Martin, aye.

Ohio.—Mr. Andrews and Mr. Moss, aye.

Pennsylvania.—Mr. Harrison, Mr. Welsh, and Mr. Coffin, aye.

Pittsburgh.—Mr. Shoenberger, Mr. Cass, Mr. Burgwin, and Mr. Howe, —

Rhode Island.—Mr. Richmond, Mr. Hoppin, and Mr. King, aye.

South Carolina.—Mr. McCrady and Mr. Smith, aye.

Tennessee.—Mr. Thompson, Mr. Stephens, and Mr. Fairbanks, aye.

Virginia.—Mr. Sheffey, Mr. Massie, and Mr. Taylor, aye.

Western New York.—Mr. Montgomery, aye.

Rev. Dr. BEERS, of Albany (when the call of the call of the roll was concluded). I wish to explain that I was absent, when the vote was taken, but solely on the ground of its unconstitutionality I vote "nay." ["Order." "Order."]

The PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order during the taking of the vote.

The result was then announced as above given.

The PRESIDENT. This House concurs with the House of Bishops in the proposed addition to Canon 20 of Title I.

OFFICE FOR BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I should like to ask permission to introduce a resolution in relation to the matter under consideration.

The PRESIDENT. Do you mean the matter just voted on?

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. No; the Baptismal question. The only object in asking permission now is to save time. I move that the order of the day now under consideration, being the resolutions on the Baptismal Office, be made the special order of the day for Tuesday morning next at eleven o'clock, and that the vote be taken at one o'clock of the same day. The object is this: many of the clerical brethren are about to leave the House to go to their parishes. We want them here, and they want to be here. They cannot be here until about noon on Monday. There is already a special order for two o'clock on Monday.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I object to that.

Mr. FORSYTH, of Albany. A great many gentlemen want to go home to vote on Tuesday in this State. They want to exercise that dearest right of freemen.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. We have strong hopes that we shall be able to adjourn on Monday.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. May I call attention to the fact that the advocates of the measure themselves express their conviction that it cannot pass? Therefore we might as well come to a vote, and not hear any more theology discussed.

Several DEPUTIES. Let us take the vote now.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I move to amend that the consideration of the subject be deferred until we have acted on the question of Rubrical Revision.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I move that we take the vote in five minutes on the baptismal question while it is fresh in our minds.

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. I understood that a motion to postpone was pending.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Is not that debatable?

Mr. BLAIR, of Maryland. No, sir.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The motion, as I understood, was that this matter be postponed and considered in connection with another matter.

Rev. Mr. BAKEWELL, of Kansas. I rise to a point of order. Mr. Jennings has the floor, and if he has not, I think I have it.

The PRESIDENT. I decided that Mr. Jennings had the floor.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. My substitute overrides the whole of that.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Long Island did not have the floor to make his motion.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. If the debate is to go on, I claim the floor.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. If the gentleman will yield the floor, I will move that the vote be taken in five minutes.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I think there is something else to be said. I do not think a layman has had five minutes yet on this question.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. If it is the pleasure of the House to go on with the argument, I shall be very happy to proceed.

Mr. President and gentlemen, the approaches to this subject have been made with the most masterly generalship and in the shrewdest manner, so as to put it before this Convention and the Church at large in its most favorable attitude. Now, sir, leaving to others to turn the flanks, I propose to move upon the centre.

This movement should be arrested—first, because

it strikes down the doctrine of our Prayer-Book upon the Sacrament of Baptism. Why, look you at the Baptismal Office itself. It opens by pronouncing that the child needs that which by nature it cannot have, and then it proceeds to prayer for that, and then it proceeds to assure all the parties that the Lord, for His part, is ready faithfully to do the thing desired, wished, and prayed for; and when the act of baptism itself is accomplished, then this resolution proposes that the minister shall be at liberty to say that the thing has not been done that was prayed for, that the necessity which was indicated in the first instance does not exist, and therefore the Lord has not been faithful to His promise, and there is nothing to thank Him for! I say, sir, that is a striking down of the doctrine of the Church itself in the Baptismal Office; and if that is not the doctrine of the Church in the Baptismal Office, there would be no desire for the alternate prayer.

It is but the entering of the wedge, for logical consistency will require that in a very few years this same movement take a still further advance calling for the blotting out of the Catechism, wherein the child is taught to say that in baptism he was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. So in the Confirmation Office; so also in the Twenty-seventh Article; so also with that definition in the Catechism, wherein it is most explicitly stated that the outward and visible sign of water in baptism is the means ordained by Christ himself for the conveying of the inward and spiritual grace. That is the doctrine of the Church, and you propose to let a man stand at the very threshold and virtually deny that that is the doctrine of the Church.

But, in the second place, the movement is to be arrested—and a more serious reason this is—because it trenches upon the very nature of the Church herself. Now to come to any proper appreciation of the nature of the Church, we must fall back upon the incarnation of our Lord, from the Immaculate Conception by the power of the Holy Ghost inward through all the unfolding of that mystery, until the glorification of Christ in our nature at the right hand of the Father. There were just such movements of incarnation as breaking the limitations of this natural state, rising above them, transcending them, finally carried our nature redeemed to the right hand of the Father in the person of the incarnation of the Son. Mark that, our nature redeemed in His person went up to the right hand of the Father. Thus was our Lord constituted "the second Adam," the head of the new humanity, the fountain source of a new and higher order of life. Therefore the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, to bring down that Divine-human light and impart it to the Apostles, and they proclaimed the Gospel of Christ, they received men into the organism, constituted by the down-coming of the Holy Ghost, in imparting the Divine-human light of the glorified Christ. How? By baptism. When those three thousand asked the Apostles in concern what they should do to come into this new humanity, into this redeemed condition, the response was simply "You should be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sin, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost by baptism; you shall be incorporated into this new creation, this supernatural constitution of grace that has come down from heaven and been constituted here and now by the descent of the Spirit of God.

The PRESIDENT. The time for the recess has arrived, and the House takes a recess for half an hour.

The session was resumed at two o'clock P.M.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT appointed as the commission on the part of the House of Deputies to suggest legislation to secure the more efficient government of the Theological Seminary, Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island; Rev. Dr. Beach, of New York; Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Livingston, of New York.

The PRESIDENT appointed Rev. William T. Webbe on the Joint Committee in charge of the stereotype plates of the standard Prayer-Book, in place of Rev. M. A. DeWolfe Howe, D.D., now a Bishop.

The PRESIDENT appointed, as members of the Joint Committee on Deaconesses, on the part of the House of Deputies, Rev. Dr. Huntington, of Massachusetts; Rev. Mr. Garrison, of New Jersey; Rev. Dr. Davies, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Welsh, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland, and Mr. Parker, of New Jersey.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that the Secretary be instructed to transmit the testimonials of the Missionary Bishops-elect to the House of Bishops.

The motion was agreed to.

CANON OF CHURCH MUSIC.

A message (No. 79) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the amendment proposed in Message No. 63 from the House of Deputies, relating to a Canon of Church Music, for the reason that it desires to retain the provisions of the resolution intended to be incorporated in the Canon, and respectfully asks for a Committee of Conference; and the House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has appointed as such Committee of Conference on its own part the Bishops of Rhode Island, Albany, and Central New York."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that a Committee of Conference be appointed on the part of this House.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Benedict, of Georgia, Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia, and Mr. Otis, of Illinois, as the Committee on the part of the House of Deputies.

PROVISION FOR THE EPISCOPATE.

The following message (No. 80) was received from the House of Bishops:

"The House of Bishops does not concur in message No. 65 from the House of Deputies proposing an amendment to Article 5 of the Constitution as to a suitable provision for the Episcopate, as at this late period of the session it has not sufficient time to consider the subject."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I think it may be well to call attention to the fact, that the lateness of the session would hardly be the reason anticipated by the Constitution. There ought to be reasons objecting to the article itself.

The PRESIDENT. That reason is given very often. The same thing has been done many times.

MISSIONARY DISTRICTS.

A message (No. 81) was received from the House of Bishops as follows:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it concurs in Message No. 66 from the House of Deputies relating to an amendment of Article 5 of the Constitution as to constituting a Missionary district in an organized Diocese."

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON CANONS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, submitted

the following reports from the Committee on Canons, which were placed on the Calendar:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 40, from the House of Bishops, proposing an amendment to Canon 2, of Title II. of the Digest, so as to empower a Bishop, under certain circumstances, to inhibit a minister before his being tried or convicted, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the House do not concur with the House of Bishops in such amendment as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House do not concur with the House of Bishops in the amendment to Canon 2, Title II., proposed to this House in Message No. 40, and relating to the inhibition of an accused minister."

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 41 from the House of Bishops, respectfully report that the message above mentioned contains the action of the House of Bishops in amending Clause [1], of Section 17, of Canon 13, of Title I., relating to the convening of the House of Bishops, but is not in the form required by Canon 2, of Title IV. The Committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution, which is virtually a concurrence with the action of the House of Bishops, but conforms to the provisions of the Canon:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Clause [1], of Section 17, of Canon 13, of Title I., is hereby amended by the insertion of the words: 'On the written request of twelve members to the same,' after the word 'shall,' in the sixth line, so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 17. [1.] If during the recess of the General Convention, and more than six months previous to its session, any vacancy arise, either by death, resignation, or other cause, in the office of any Missionary Bishop of this Church (whether domestic or foreign), the House of Bishops shall, on the written request of twelve members of the same, be convened by the Presiding Bishop, or, in case of his death, by the Bishop who, according to the rules of the House of Bishops, is to preside at the next General Convention; and thereupon may proceed to fill any and every such vacancy that may then exist, by electing a suitable person or persons to be a Bishop or Bishops of this Church, to exercise Episcopal functions within the district, place, country, territory, station, or jurisdiction, where such vacancy or vacancies may exist; and in case of such election, they shall, by the Presiding Bishop, or by some person or persons specially appointed, communicate the fact of such election to the Standing Committees of the Churches in the different Dioceses; and each Standing Committee that shall consent to the proposed consecration shall forward the evidence of such consent to the Presiding Bishop, or Bishop aforesaid. And if the major number of the Standing Committees shall consent to the proposed consecration, the Presiding or other Bishop as aforesaid shall forward copies of the evidence of such consent to each Bishop of this Church then within the limits of the United States; and if a majority of such Bishops consent to the consecration, the Presiding Bishop or Bishop aforesaid, with any two Bishops, or any three Bishops to whom he may communicate the testimonials, may proceed to perform the same."

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 42 from the House of Bishops, proposing an amendment to Clause [2], of Section 2, of Canon 13, of Title I., of the Digest, so as to require a vote of a majority of all the Bishops entitled to seats and votes in the House of Bishops, in order to their consent to the consecration of a Bishop-elect, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend that the House do not concur

with the House of Bishops in such amendment, as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House do not concur with the House of Bishops in the amendment to Section 2, of Canon 13, Title I., proposed to this House in Message No. 42, and relating to the consent of the House of Bishops to the consecration of Bishops-elect."

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution 'touching the *status* of Missionary Bishops,' etc., respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that no action upon that subject would be expedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of the *status* of Missionary Bishops," etc.

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution in regard to the form of certificate to be given by Standing Committees to candidates for Holy Orders, respectfully report that they have considered the same, and are of the opinion that no action upon the subject would be expedient. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of the testimonials of candidates for Holy Orders."

"The Committee on Canons, being charged by Canon 2 of Title IV. with the duty of appointing, at the close of the session, two of their number to certify the changes made in the Canons, and to report the same, with the proper arrangement thereof, to the Secretary, acting in connection with two of the Committee on Canons of the House of Bishops, to be appointed by such Committee, respectfully report that they have appointed for the abovenamed purpose the Rev. Alfred B. Beach, D.D., of New York, and Mr. Hill Burgwin, of Pittsburgh; and they recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That information of the appointment by the Committee on Canons of this House of the Rev. Alfred B. Beach, D.D., and Mr. Hill Burgwin, to certify the changes made in the Canons at the present session, be sent to the House of Bishops."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I would ask the House to pass upon the resolution appended to this last report immediately. It will lead, I suppose, to no debate.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would respectfully suggest that, inasmuch as constitutional amendments have now been separated from the Canons, it would be well also to add the names of two members of the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution to certify to their part of the work. This Committee is a new phase in our history.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Let the resolution go on the Calendar, then.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Probably they can find some way of certifying to their part, and they may as well be acted on now.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of Long Island. Then I move that this resolution pass.

The resolution was agreed to.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. In behalf of the Committee to whom was referred the matter of the adjournment of the General Convention, I would report that we have made arrangements for the use of this Church until half-past five o'clock this afternoon. We have also consulted the Secretary of the House of Bishops and several Bishops, and they agree in thinking that their business can all be discharged by Monday evening. Therefore the Com-

mittee recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That this House will adjourn *sine die* on Monday evening, November 24, after the usual devotional services and the reading of the Pastoral Letter."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The Chairman of the Committee has made a formal report. I can make an informal one, which is that probably the House of Bishops will send down another Bishop for our confirmation to-day, and, therefore, it is important that we should remain in session this evening as long as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Virginia. I move that we extend to-day's session until half-past five o'clock this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution to adjourn *sine die* on Monday evening after devotional services and hearing the Pastoral Letter.

The resolution was agreed to.

OFFICE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The House resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee on Canons, on the Baptismal Office.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I beg leave to introduce a motion that this question be deferred.

The PRESIDENT. I do not think that motion can be received except with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri (Rev. Mr. Jennings), who was addressing the House when we took the recess.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Will the gentleman give his consent to the introduction of this motion?

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I am not willing to have anything interjected into this discussion.

The PRESIDENT. Then you will proceed. You have ten minutes left.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. Resuming the thread of argument, are we to regard the Church as a heap of sand, a mechanical aggregation of individuals? Is it not an organism vital in the power of the Holy Ghost, having one common life, with Christ its head, and that derived directly from Him by the power of the Holy Ghost? Is it nothing for a man to pass from the world into such a state of things as this? If a man goes into a masonic lodge, he goes into an organism, and his initiation into it is a partaking of its life, and thereafter, under a normal development, he may expect to become a mature mason. If a foreigner comes to this country and is naturalized, the naturalization engrafts him into our body corporate and makes him, *ipso facto*, a partaker of its life. Thereafter the normal process of things will develop that man into a thorough American citizen, instinct with American feeling, permeated with American principle. If this be true in merely human organizations, certainly it is just as true of the supernatural constitution of this great organism from Heaven. It takes a child or a man, and engraving him into itself, thereby it separates him from the kingdom of Satan and darkness and death, and receives him into the kingdom of grace, incorporates him into the body of Christ, and makes him a partaker of the life common to the head and to the body. Now, the normal procedure afterwards, though it may be avoided in a thousand ways, will be the building up on that foundation, by the power of the Holy Ghost, of a supernatural, saintly character: and yet you will allow by these resolutions the Presbyter or Minister to stand at the very font itself, and deny the intrinsic, essential nature of the Church, deny what the Jews all believed

when the Gentile came from the outside world into the Jewish commonwealth by baptism and circumcision, that he thereby was regenerate. That was the very technical term used, and it passed over very naturally to the Church. Yet you would allow the minister standing up at the font to deny it all. Brethren, the Church knows her own nature, and she knows that the minister in baptism has no right to speak his own individual sentiments, but that he is her minister speaking in her name, and has no right to speak any other words than she authorizes and instructs him to speak.

Now, a third reason why we must arrest this movement forthwith—and I must pass over these points very briefly—is that it would emasculate the Apostles' Creed. It mangles it and tears out of it one of its most precious articles. Brethren, that Creed is the absolute faith itself and not a series of human opinions gathered together, made up after study and reflection upon the New Testament, for generally it came into being before the New Testament began to be written. That Creed was simply the Church, conscious of the mystery of the incarnation and her part therein, gazing with the eye of faith upon the evolving of that mystery, and reciting its glorious facts. In that Creed she goes through the proofs of the incarnation up to the point of the glorification of our redeemed humanity in the person of her Lord. Thereupon, by a logic of faith, she proceeds in the Creed to recite the coming down of the Holy Ghost to make over that Divine-human law, that revealed humanity, to men on the day of Pentecost. Thereupon, proceeding from that, she proceeds to recite, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." You see how it was constituted then, and from the body of Christ, by the down-coming of the Holy Ghost on that Pentecostal day. Instantly after that: "I believe in the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins"—to be had only in the Church, as all benefits of American citizenship are to be had only in that citizenship, within that country, as all benefits that may be supposed to belong to the masonic lodge, if you please, are to be had only by virtue of membership in it. So "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," because it is in the Church that we obtain this, the initial point, in the innumerable benefits of Christ's redemption. And so the Creed goes on culminating in "the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." You must remember, brethren, that this article of the Creed was exemplified and explained, if explanation were necessary, in the Creed of the Council of Nicaea—"I believe in one baptism for the remission of sins." If there could be any possible question as to the meaning of that phrase in the Apostles' Creed, the corresponding phrase in the Nicene Creed settles it.

Now, brethren, to trouble you and take your time at this supreme moment no further, let me say that the hour has struck. The bringing in of these resolutions by the Committee on Canons is the alarm-bell ringing that the conflict is upon us. It is a conflict between rationalism and supernaturalism. Where shall we stand? Is there any uncertainty? Are we going to break away all the barriers? We will fling the banner to the breeze, and we will by an emphatic vote bury this proposition beyond the possibility of resurrection.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, I do not intend to touch upon the theology connected with this question. As a layman I do not think that my province, but as a layman I do think it my province to be able to point out some of the practical questions connected with the subject.

Now, sir, the first one that is presented to my mind is this: That here, for almost the first time in

two hundred years, we are seriously considering the alteration of a fundamental doctrine of this Church. It has surprised and astonished me to hear statements and assertions made here that this proposition to change one word in a Rubric was a trifling affair—not of any serious consequence. I have been astounded that gentlemen could entertain such an idea; and even our most respected Committee on Canons have said that they do not propose by the change of this word to change the doctrine of the Church. I cannot conceive how, by the slightest reflection, gentlemen can come to that conclusion. What will be the consequence of changing that word? Suppose it possible that this Church can, at this stage of the world, change this word in that Rubric, where shall we then stand, and to what will it lead? I maintain that it is the initial edge of that wedge which, although it may not be intended, yet will inevitably have the effect of splitting that doctrine which has stood so many centuries.

Now, let me point out what appears to me to be some of the consequences of an act of this kind. Suppose we do adopt it, and it finally becomes a law, what follows as an inevitable consequence of this thin edge of the wedge? The wedge must inevitably be driven home, and in this way. We must alter the Rubric prescribing that in the Catechism of the Church the clergy must teach the doctrine as it is laid down by the Church. Either the doctrine is altered or they must by the Rubric of the Catechism teach the doctrine, and what follows? What is the next step in driving the wedge? I maintain the next step will be the absolute necessity of altering the ordination vow, for can a minister come forward and take the ordination vow to teach the doctrines of the Church, when he has by permission of the Church the authority to omit teaching that doctrine? I trow not, sir.

These are two consequences. There have been others pointed out by the clerical gentleman from Missouri; but these inevitable consequences might be multiplied almost indefinitely. If such a thing is possible in one case, it is possible in others. Suppose for a moment that the word "shall" in the Rubrics of our Church should be changed to the word "may," wherever it occurs. I ask you, gentlemen, whether the natural consequence of that would not be that we could invite most cordially and legitimately the Reformed Episcopal Church and its Prayer-Book to come into union with this Church? It seems to me that follows as a natural consequence, just as we know when the sun sets that it will rise.

I will not say a word upon the doctrine itself, because I suppose that every man here concedes the fact that this term "regenerate" does in some sense absolutely show the correct doctrine of the Church. I will only say in reference to it that if there is any doctrine of our Church that is proved by Scripture and that is plainly set forth in our Liturgy, it is this doctrine, sanctioned, as it has been, by the most remarkable testimony that it is possible to deduce in reference to any doctrine of this Church. When our Divine Lord established this ordinance, He not only did it by precept, but what did he do? He did it by example. He submitted to the ordinance Himself, and what occurred virtually? The heavens opened and the Holy Spirit descended upon Him like a dove. What did all that signify? Did it not signify what is traced in the language of our doctrines and our Catechism, that baptism is "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace"? What is plainer?

I do trust that on this occasion we shall give such an emphatic denial to this proposition that it will

be buried beyond the hope of resurrection, beyond the expectation of any resurrection.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky, obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me to move that after his speech the vote be taken?

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I simply rise to renew the motion which I have made several times, though it seems it was out of order before, that the further consideration of this subject be deferred until after action upon the resolution for a Rubrical Commission; and I do this with a view to the referring of this question to that Committee.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT. The motion is open to debate.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I will put it then in this form, that this question be laid on the table until after action on the Rubrical Commission, to be then referred to that Commission.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I move as an amendment to that to take the question without further debate.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I understand the motion is to lay on the table. The gentleman merely gives information of his desire.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable, but a motion to lay on the table with a circumstance is debatable.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The motion is to lay on the table.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Until after the Rubrical Commission is appointed.

Rev. Dr. PERKINS, of Kentucky. I moved to lay it on the table, and I stated the end I had in view in making the motion.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move to lay on the table.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Can that motion be amended?

The PRESIDENT. It cannot.

Rev. Mr. BAKEWELL, of Kansas. Is it not in order for the gentleman who makes this motion to allow me to make a statement to the House?

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made the motion, and does not listen to any appeal to withdraw it.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I have no right to do so. I will now, however, put the motion in the proper form. It is to lay on the table the report of the Committee on Canon No. 18.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. A vote in the affirmative puts the whole matter on the table, I believe?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Rev. Dr. RUDDER, of Pennsylvania. And a vote in the negative refuses so to dispose of the matter?

The PRESIDENT. I am requested to state what will be the effect of laying on the table. Any question may be laid upon the table, and it is subject thereafter to be taken up at any time at the will of the house. If you lay this resolution on the table, it may be according to the sense of the House a *quies*, or it may be taken up at any future time. It is the will of the House that will determine its ultimate fate.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Allow me to ask a question touching this very point. If it is laid on the table, what hinders us immediately, as soon as the Rubrical Commission is appointed, from calling it up and moving to refer it to that Commission?

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. We want to vote directly on the merits of the question.

Mr. MEADS, of Albany. If the House want to vote directly on the merits, let it be on a motion to postpone indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion to lay on the table.

The motion was not agreed to.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move that the vote be taken in five minutes.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. The Diocese of Pittsburgh calls for a vote by Dioceses and orders on the main question.

The PRESIDENT. The motion now is that the House order the vote on the main question to be taken in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, I have only five minutes, and I intend to use them, because my name has been used in a manner against which I utterly protest. It has been circulated in this Convention that I intended to advocate the change of the Rubric which has been proposed. I wish explicitly to say that I have been trying all the morning to speak against it. Who are the men that ask this? Are they men who confess their own troubled minds? Not at all. They are men who say: "Oh, no; we have no trouble about it."

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. I rise to call the gentleman to order.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I hope this will not come out of my time.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. I can answer all that, but I have no time.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Am I in order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. I cannot understand how you are out of order as yet.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. The gentleman makes a statement which is not altogether correct.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. The men who are in favor of this thing now are not the old Evangelicals who carried the Evangelical banner so nobly. They are not men like the honored representative from Massachusetts, nor like the noble Deputy from Virginia; but they are men whose voices are not heard and whose persons are not seen. Who are they? I say that they are not brave men, or they would send us a petition saying, "Our conscience is troubled."

The Reverend Deputy from Massachusetts has appealed to the Gorham case, in which it was decided that men could hold the doctrine of Mr. Gorham, which is that of the petitioners or of those who are petitioned for within the limits of the Church. Now it is proposed that the Church shall take that view that I am opposed to.

Again, it has been said, in spite of all this, doctrine is not touched. Why, sir, the whole Catechism is intended to be swept away, and not only the Catechism, but belief in the grace of Holy Baptism which that Catechism teaches is to be swept away. Although the Reverend Deputy from Massachusetts said this morning that after the baptism the grace of baptism has been bestowed, and therefore it is of no importance what a man says; still he would persuade us that it is lawful to deny that there has been any grace bestowed, or anything to be particularly thankful for. If we can sweep away these things from the Baptismal Office, after what the Reverend Deputy from Massachusetts said this morning, I confess that my convictions is that we must sweep away our article of the Nicene Creed, that we must sweep away half a dozen sentences from the Holy Scriptures; that we must sweep away the words of our blessed Lord in his dialogue with Nicodemus.

I am not surprised that the Deputy has repudiated the article of the Bishop as published at the last

General Convention. I really expected three years ago that it would be proved by somebody that the Bishops had been mistaken. That was done admirably by the Deputy from Massachusetts this morning; but I think there is no good reason for going further and faring still worse.

And yet we are told that doctrine is not at all involved. Why, it strikes at the whole scheme and system of doctrine of this Church; and that must be done, forsooth, because men have troubled consciences! I think we have some conscience ourselves. This thing puts me very much in mind of what the Bishop of Alabama—a very witty man—once said to a man who could not take the Apostles' Creed. Said he, "I cannot take the Apostles' Creed, or I would join your Church to-morrow; I cannot swallow it, sir." "Well," said my Bishop, "it might be well for you to consider, my friend, whether there is not something the matter with your swallow, instead of with the Creed." [Laughter.]

As to the Apostolicity and validity of Bishop Cummins's sect, I have this to say, that I deny it to be in any sense Apostolic; I deny that the first fragment of Apostolicity belongs to it. If I admit that his ordinations may be valid, it is because I admit that a man's son is his son, although he may be very unlike his father.

In conclusion, for I have only half a minute of my five minutes, this comes to us under the head of a threat: "Men are waiting to see what we do, in order that they may go out." If they are going out to Bishop Cummins's schism, by all means let them go, and I shall be thankful to the Cummins schism for operating on this Church as a blister to which all such elements may be drawn.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. The Diocese of Pittsburgh calls for a vote by Dioceses and orders.

Rev. Mr. BAKEWELL, of Kansas. Are the five minutes up?

The PRESIDENT. The House has directed the vote to be now taken. A vote is called for by Dioceses and orders. The resolutions now to be voted on will be read for the information of the House.

The Secretary read as follows:

"1. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be, and hereby is, proposed to add as a Rubric at the end of the Office for Infant Baptism the words following, viz.:

"The minister may at his discretion omit the exhortation preceding the Lord's Prayer in the above Office, and in place of the Thanksgiving substitute the Collect for Easter Even. This Rubric, however, is not to be construed as implying any change in the doctrine of the Church.

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Secretary of the House of Deputies cause the proposed Rubric to be made known to the Dioceses, as required by the Constitution and Canons."

The question being taken, resulted as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE.—Dioceses represented, 40; ayes, 5; noes, 34; divided, 1.

LAY VOTE.—Dioceses represented, 31; ayes, 6; noes, 24; divided, 1.

The vote in detail is as follows:

CLERGY.

Alabama.—Rev. Dr. Stringfellow and Rev. Dr. Fulton, nay.

Albany.—Rev. Dr. Beers and Rev. Dr. Brown, nay.

Arkansas.—Rev. Mr. Trimble and Rev. Mr. Bruce, nay.

California.—Rev. Mr. Chetwood and Rev. Mr. Githens, nay.

Central New York.—Rev. Dr. Wilson, Rev. Dr. Ayrault, and Rev. Mr. Hitchcock, nay.

Central Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Parct, Rev. Mr. Marple, and Rev. Mr. Leverett, nay.

Connecticut.—Rev. Mr. Johnson, nay.

Delaware.—Rev. Mr. Douglass, aye.

Easton.—Rev. Dr. Crosdale and Rev. Dr. Fulton, nay.

Florida.—Rev. Mr. Thackara, nay.

Georgia.—Rev. Dr. Benedict, aye. Rev. Dr. Williams, nay.

Illinois.—Rev. Dr. Chase, Rev. Dr. Corbett, and Rev. Mr. Knowles, nay.

Indiana.—Rev. Mr. Dunham, nay.

Iowa.—Rev. Mr. Goodhue, nay.

Kansas.—Rev. Dr. Reynolds and Rev. Mr. Beatty, aye; Rev. Mr. Bakewell, nay.

Kentucky.—Rev. Dr. Perkins, aye. Rev. Dr. Craik and Rev. Mr. Shipman, nay.

Long Island.—Rev. Dr. Schenck, aye; Rev. Dr. Hall, Rev. Dr. Diller, and Rev. Dr. Haskins, nay.

Louisiana.—Rev. Mr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Girault, Rev. Mr. Harris, and Rev. Dr. Dalzell, nay.

Maine.—Rev. Mr. Leffingwell, Rev. Mr. Ward, and Rev. Dr. Pise, nay.

Maryland.—Rev. Dr. Lewin, Rev. Dr. Leeds, and Rev. Dr. Dudley, nay.

Massachusetts.—Rev. Dr. Vinton, aye; Rev. Dr. Burgess and Rev. Dr. Lambert, nay.

Michigan.—Rev. Mr. Gillespie, Rev. Mr. Brown, Rev. Mr. Earp, and Rev. Mr. Worthington, nay.

Minnesota.—Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker, nay.

Mississippi.—Rev. Dr. Crane, Rev. Dr. Sansom, Rev. Mr. Douglass, and Rev. Mr. Marks, nay.

Missouri.—Rev. Dr. Runcie and Rev. Mr. Jennings, nay.

Nebraska.—Rev. Mr. Shaw, nay.

New Hampshire.—Rev. Dr. Hubbard and Rev. Dr. Herrick, nay.

New Jersey.—Rev. Dr. Clark, aye. Rev. Dr. Farrington and Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, nay.

New York.—Rev. Dr. Cady and Rev. Dr. Geer, nay.

North Carolina.—Rev. Dr. Watson, Rev. Dr. Smedes, and Rev. Dr. Buxton, nay.

Ohio.—Rev. Dr. Burr and Rev. Dr. Boyd, aye.

Pennsylvania.—Rev. Dr. Rudder and Rev. Dr. Davies, nay.

Pittsburgh.—Rev. Dr. Scarborough, Rev. Mr. Getz, Rev. Mr. Smith, and Rev. Dr. Spalding, nay.

Rhode Island.—Rev. Mr. Locke, aye.

South Carolina.—Rev. Mr. Pinckney, aye. Rev. Mr. Porter and Rev. Mr. McCullough, nay.

Texas.—Rev. Mr. Bird, Rev. Mr. Richardson, and Rev. Mr. Davenport, nay.

Vermont.—Rev. Dr. Douglass, Rev. Mr. Bliss, and Rev. Mr. Putnam, nay.

Virginia.—Rev. Mr. Hanckel and Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, aye.

Western New York.—Rev. Dr. Foote, Rev. Dr. Rankine, and Rev. Mr. Mann, nay.

Wisconsin.—Rev. Dr. De Koven, Rev. Dr. Adams, Rev. Mr. Haff, and Rev. Mr. Ten Broeck, nay.

LAITY.

Albany.—Mr. Meads, nay.

California.—Mr. Webb and Mr. Walsh, nay.

Central New York.—Mr. Chedell, Mr. McWhorter, and Mr. Clarke, nay.

Connecticut.—Mr. Stark, nay.

Delaware.—Mr. Fell, aye.

Easton.—Mr. Goldsborough, nay.

Georgia.—Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Whittle, aye.

Illinois.—Mr. Otis and Mr. Whitehouse, nay.

Kansas.—Mr. Bartholow, aye.

Kentucky.—Mr. Stephenson, aye.

Long Island.—Mr. Pierrepont, Mr. King, and Mr. Nicholi, nay.

Louisiana.—Mr. Race, nay.

Maryland.—Mr. Blair, nay.

Massachusetts.—Mr. Mason and Mr. Shattuck, nay.
Michigan.—Mr. Trowbridge, nay.
Minnesota.—Mr. Wilder, nay.
Missouri.—Mr. Douglass, nay.
New Jersey.—Mr. Garthwaite and Mr. Meigs, nay.
New York.—Mr. Ruggles and Mr. Livingston, nay.
North Carolina.—Mr. De Rosset and Mr. Martin, nay.
Ohio.—Mr. Andrews, aye. Mr. Moss, nay.
Pennsylvania.—Mr. Welsh, nay.
Pittsburgh.—Mr. Shoenberger, Mr. Cass, and Mr. Burgwin, nay. Mr. Howe, aye.
Rhode Island.—Mr. Hoppin and Mr. King, aye.
 Mr. Richmond, nay.
South Carolina.—Mr. McCrady and Mr. Smith, nay.
Tennessee.—Mr. Fairbanks, nay.
Vermont.—Mr. Canfield, nay.
Virginia.—Mr. Sheffey, Mr. Massie, and Mr. Taylor, aye.
Western New York.—Mr. Montgomery, nay.
Wisconsin.—Mr. Clark, nay.
 So the resolutions were rejected.

THE NEW HYMNAL.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I should like, with consent, to offer a resolution that I think will excite no debate. I can only apologize that it seems on this unfortunate Hymnal we get more and more into trouble, but I think this is the last tinkering with it. I offer the following resolution:

"Whereas, some typographical and literary mistakes have been found in the Revised Hymnal, and also in the printed schedule of the changes reported by the Committee on the Hymnal; therefore, "Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the trustees of the fund for the relief of the widows of deceased clergymen, and of aged, infirm, and disabled clergymen, be authorized to correct the Hymnal now to be printed, so as to make it accurate and conform to the standard edition prepared for the Bishops, with such changes as were intended by the said Committee on the Hymnal."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I would ask the reverend doctor who makes that motion what he means by "such changes as were intended by the committee"?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Those that were upon the separate paper which was put in the pews. About forty of those, I can explain, were a word here and a letter there, all mentioned on the paper.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. What I mean is this: Is there any written or printed memorandum of the intention of the Committee? If there be not, I am opposed to giving an unlimited license to the Committee or any one else.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. They do not want an unlimited license. They only want the things that were printed to be in the book. I have in my hand three papers. Scrupulous members were anxious, and at the time, not having them in my hand, the question was raised what was meant. It was these papers which were printed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, of New York. Allow me to correct that slightly. It is very important that the House should understand this. The printed schedule was in some instances incorrect, as in one or two instances it says, "In Prayer-Book," when it meant "In Hymnal," and there is one instance where they say, "In Hymnal," when it intended "In Prayer-Book." In that case there is call for the reprinting of a hymn. We have the hymn in two forms. Unless this resolution is adopted you will have the hymn with two verses, and you will have the hymn

differently as printed in the Hymnal. These are clerical mistakes.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I ask that the resolution be again read, that we may understand it exactly.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read. The Secretary read the resolution.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move to strike out the last clause so as to confine it to the correction of literary and typographical errors.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. If the resolution is to be amended, it is better that it should go on the Calendar. If left as it is, I suppose it would get these gentlemen out of a very great difficulty without altering the character as to doctrine or the literary character of the Hymnal.

Rev. Dr. GEER, of New York. This is an important matter, because it is known that, as soon as this Hymnal is before the Church, there will be from all quarters suggestions in regard to what are deemed minor alterations. There were alterations before which caused a great deal of trouble, and it was stated in the Church papers that the alterations were made by authority, and public announcement was made in the services that such alterations had been made, but by what authority was unknown to the Committee. I therefore believe that the objection raised by Judge Sheffey is quite important.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution goes on the Calendar.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I suggest that these words be added:

"Provided, however, That no other than clerical and typographical errors be corrected."

That would cover it.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that the resolution just offered by the Clerical Deputy from Long Island be committed to a Select Committee of five, to report a proper resolution, on Monday next, in reference to the Hymnal.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed as the Committee Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island; Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island; Rev. Dr. Geer, of New York; Mr. Sheffey, of Virginia, and Mr. Pierrepoint, of Long Island.

EFFECT OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will announce the Joint Committee to ascertain and report on the legal effect of the joint resolutions, in accordance with a message from the House of Bishops, which was received and concurred in yesterday: Rev. Dr. Mead, of Connecticut; Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island; Rev. Dr. Minnigerode, of Virginia; Mr. Sheffey, of Virginia; Mr. Comstock, of Central New York, and Mr. Mills, of New Jersey.

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Upon our Calendar there are a great many matters which, if reached, can be passed without any objection, and that it is very important should be passed on. I move, therefore, that the House take up the Calendar on Monday at ten o'clock, and go regularly through it so as to dispose of the business upon it.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. That does not interfere with the special order at two o'clock?

The PRESIDENT. I think not.

Mr. BURGWIN. We expect to get through in half an hour.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIGIOUS REFORM ABROAD.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution which will involve no discussion.

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring),

That another member of that House be added to the Joint Committee on Ecclesiastical Relations and Religious Reform."

I offer this at the request of some members of the House of Bishops that they may appoint an additional member. They only ask to add another member of their House who has a very thorough knowledge of the subject. It is necessary to do this by concurrent action, as the Committee has already been appointed under the action of both Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

ALTERATION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The business which now comes up under order is the reports of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, and the one first in order is as to the alteration of the Prayer-Book. I beg leave to read a sentence from that report in order that every one may get the idea of the report.

"But by the present wise provision of the Constitution no alteration can be made in the Prayer-Book, unless the desired changes in all essential details have been proposed in one General Convention, made known to each Diocesan Convention, and adopted at the next General Convention, thus securing three full years for their examination and approval. And thus is obtained that deliberate sanction which the Constitution intended to secure in such an important matter."

That is the gist of the report. The resolution at the end of it is:

"Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from further consideration of this subject."

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There is a report which was made on the eighteenth day on Article 3, declining to make any change in the article. The mind of the Committee on this point, although not expressed in the report, is simply that it is unwise to make any changes in the third article of the Constitution. My own explanation of their mind is that until the House of Bishops shall surrender the secret session, it is inexpedient to extend the three days or make other changes in that article. That is not in the report, but that is what I think of it. If they will give us the power of knowing what is being done, we can extend the time; otherwise, when we give anything into their hands, we know nothing about it until it comes back at a later time. The resolution is simply that the Committee be discharged.

The Secretary read the report as follows:

"The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom were referred sundry amendments to Article 3 of the Constitution, proposed by Dr. Leeds, of Maryland, Mr. Montgomery, of Georgia, Mr. Blanchard, of Maryland, *et al.*, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report: That in the opinion of the Committee it is desirable to retain the provisions of said articles, requiring the House of Bishops to signify to this House their approbation or disapprobation (the latter with their reasons in writing) within a specified time, to the end that this House may know what has been done; and in case of non-concurrence, the reasons therefor, which will enable the House to meet the issue thus raised.

"Also to retain that provision which makes any Bishop present *ex officio* a member of the House until there are three or more Bishops in attendance—for surely, in such a case, such Bishop or Bishops would make most valuable members of this House. And it is not advisable to dispense with such assistance.

"The Committee submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient, at this time, to adopt any of the said amendments proposed to Article 3 of the Constitution."

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEPUTIES.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I should be very much gratified if I might be allowed now to present the other reports, in an order that I think will avoid debate upon two or three of them and let them go, otherwise I must go on in regular order.

Several DEPUTIES. Go on in your own way.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would bring up next a report made on the 19th day on Supplementary Deputies, a question put to the Committee, and answered on the 159th page of THE DAILY CHURCHMAN. The conclusion of the report is that the Committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, as the matter really belongs to the Dioceses.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I move that the request of the Committee to be discharged be granted.

The motion was agreed to.

CLERICAL TRIALS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Then a question was put to the Committee whether it might not be well to insert an article requiring in all cases of trials of clergymen a verdict of two-thirds of the court. The conclusion is that it is not within our power to order in that manner. The resolution is that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I ask the Chairman what was the main reason for not considering it? Was it that it was within the power of the Dioceses?

Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island. Yes, sir: it belongs to the Dioceses.

The resolution was adopted.

CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. A report was made on an ecclesiastical commission not to examine the Prayer-Book, but the Constitution, and the report was against it. It is in these words:

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient at this time to institute any commission to revise and amend the Constitution of the Church."

The resolution was agreed to.

COURT OF APPEALS.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There is a report of the same character in regard to a Court of Appeals, against it. The report is as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to which was referred the message of the House of Bishops No. 33, and several resolutions upon the subject of an Amendment to the Constitution to empower the General Convention to create a Court of Appeals, respectfully report that they have considered the subject, and while there was some difference of opinion, a decided majority deemed it inexpedient to make such amendment. Your Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That it is not expedient to amend the Constitution so as to authorize the General Convention to establish a Court of Appeals.

"Resolved, That this House does not concur in the resolution of the House of Bishops in Message No. 33.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I should like that put on the Calendar.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. That opens it to discussion.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not care to discuss it, but I do not propose to commit the Convention against a Court of Appeals.

Several DEPUTIES. Move to lay it on the table, then.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move to lay it on the table.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean to call it up again?

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. No, sir; I merely wish to let it die with this Convention. It is too late to discuss it.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SHORTENED FORMS OF PRAYER.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Now, I leave the Convention to judge for themselves which shall come up next. Our report is on shortened forms of prayer, and offering a change in the Constitution in order to provide for it, and the other on the provincial system. The first on shortened forms of prayer I will read:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom was referred a resolution asking a report upon the expediency of proposing an amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution, have had the same under consideration, and respectfully report the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following be proposed and made known to the several Dioceses as an Amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution, to be added at the end of the Article as it now stands, to wit, the words, 'Provided that the General Convention may, by Canon, arrange and set forth a shortened form of Morning and Evening Prayer, to be compiled wholly from the Book of Common Prayer; or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use.'"

At the last Convention the House of Deputies did pass a resolution to that effect, but the House of Bishops concurred in and defeated it. As I understand it, the House of Bishops have sent down something in the form of a change of Lectionary, so that it seems it was proper for us to lay the matter before the Convention that they might decide whether it is expedient to reach shortened forms of prayer in this method, or in any other method. That question and the question of the provincial system, whichever the Convention choose to consider first, I will now call up.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. So the Committee report that we may provide for shortened services without altering the Prayer-Book?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. No, sir; a former report was made that we could not.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Is the Lectionary included in it?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Lectionary will be included in the form of prayer made by Canon if this change be made. Will the Convention take up that subject? If so, I will offer the report.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I understand that this report proposes that the Constitution shall be so amended as that shortened forms of morning and evening prayer can be set forth either by the General Convention or by any of the Dioceses. I do not wish to say anything about it, but simply to remind the Convention that at present we have a Prayer-Book, which leaves it to be inferred that we ought to say morning and evening prayer every day, and the daily services of the Protestant Episcopal Church has become an impossibility except in certain places. In England they had the same difficulty

and not long ago they amended the act of uniformity so as to permit shortened services to be put forth and those shortened services are in use at this present time in the Church of England. The Morning Prayer in the Church of England consists of the saying of one sentence of the Sentences, the Confession, the Absolution, the Lord's Prayer, the Versicles that follow, one Psalm or more from the Psalter, one Lesson, one Canticle, the Creed, the Versicles, three Collects, and the Prayer of St. Chrysostom. That is the shortened service, which can be said, if it is said without being sung, in twelve minutes, and can be sung, say, in fifteen minutes. We cannot do this, it seems, because it is contrary to our Constitution; and in order to get at it in the shortest way possible it is proposed that the Constitution of the Church shall be so amended as to permit this very necessary and desirable thing. I trust this House will unanimously adopt the proposed amendment to the Constitution which this Committee has brought in.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I should like to ask whether it is for Sundays as well as week-days? ("Yes," "Yes," "No," "No.")

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I answer that I understand it is not for Sundays; on the contrary, Sundays, Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Ascension Day, and Good Friday, are all excepted.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. That was my own impression.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I wish also to ask—and perhaps the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin can answer—whether in the case of the Church of England it is not so ordered that there is one uniform order of shortened prayer throughout the kingdom?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Whereas the proposal before us would leave it a standing discord and confusion, in that it leaves it to each separate Diocese to elect as it chooses, and instead of uniform shortened services it gives liberty to each Diocese, as I understand.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. That difficulty may be met by striking out that clause, so as to leave it to the General Convention instead of the Diocese.

Rev. Dr. DUDLEY, of Maryland. I can answer that there is no proposal that at this time we shall do this on Sunday or any other day. It is to leave it to be done by Canon. The amendment is merely that the Constitution shall give the power to the Convention. That settles all these questions.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. That is the elemental principle, that this matter shall be canonical. You passed a Canon in the last Convention in this House, and the Bishops refused to concur in it because it was unconstitutional. We now declare it to be constitutional by proposing to amend the constitution so that this change, and no other, can be made canonically.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina, obtained the floor.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I hope the report will be read before the gentleman goes on.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The report has been read, but I will read Article 8 of the Constitution as it will stand if amended as we propose:

"A Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, Articles of Religion, and a Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those Dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution. No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer or other Offices of the Church, or

the Articles of Religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every Diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention: *Provided*, that the General Convention may, by Canon, arrange and set forth a shortened form of Morning and Evening Prayer, to be compiled wholly from the Book of Common Prayer; or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use."

It is simply giving to the Convention that much power.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I must beg leave to say that while I desire that there should be a mode of shortening the services as much as any one here, I object to this mode, and think it can be done in a better mode. I submit my view to you and you can judge.

It is to be remarked that here you are getting a change in the Prayer-Book by changing the Constitution. I am opposed to that entirely. It is easier for you to change the Constitution and get command of the Prayer-Book very often, than it would be to change the Prayer-Book itself in the allowed mode.

The way to change the Prayer-Book is marked out for you in the Constitution. You do not go to that, you do not try to change the Prayer-Book, but you seek to change the Constitution so as to give this body power to change the Prayer-Book. That is a very serious thing. Once let the Convention discover that they can, without changing the Prayer-Book in the manner the Constitution provides, change the Constitution so as to get at the Prayer-Book, and you leave everything in doubt. This same thing can be accomplished by a Rubric. It is the Prayer-Book you want to alter. It takes no more trouble to put in a Rubric than it does to amend the Constitution; but the other is straightforward, and goes directly to the object, and then, when it is put there, it is not left open afterwards to be changed by Canon. You do not give this body or any other body power to do just what they please, for remember now that when this question came up, and when the question about the Lectionary was brought up, the gentleman from Western New York said that that would be covered by this proposition. Then is this Convention to have power at any time to change the whole of the Lectionary? Are you ready to do that? I am not willing to do that. I am not willing to allow this Convention to direct a change in our Lectionary every three years, and to make alterations whenever they please. What I want to do is to fix the thing so that it may be done, but to put the limit saying where they must stop.

I have drawn this Rubric relative to the order of Morning Prayer. Listen to it; and if I can get no more than this, I ask you to allow this to go down to the different Dioceses along with the other, and let us think three years on it and see which is the best way to do it.

"Order how the Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany, and Occasional Prayers shall or may be said, and how the Psalms and Lessons for the day may be changed."

What is the title of the Rubric?

"On Sundays and on all fasts and festivals appointed by the Church, no change shall be allowed in any organized church, parish, or congregation, within any organized Diocese. On all other days, and all other occasions on those days other than the regular morning and evening service, each Diocese"—

I confine it to the Dioceses, they knowing best their own ways—

—"may, by the action of its Convention, approved by the Bishop, allow to its Presbyters and organized

churches and parishes and congregations such liberty by the omission of some and substitution of lessons and psalms as each Diocese shall see fit. But nothing shall be added thereto except that the Bishop may set forth special prayers to be used on special occasions, and may also set forth special service for extraordinary occasions.

"Liberty in all these respects may be given to Missionary Bishops by the House of Bishops for all occasions, under such limitations and restrictions as the House of Bishops may, by their solemn order, declare."

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. May I ask the gentleman how long it would take to accomplish this purpose?

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. The very same time it will take to accomplish the other, and I am very willing that both propositions should go down, and let three years' deliberation pass upon them. If this be approved, after examination, I am sure it is better than the other.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. I ask the gentleman if he meant to deny this power of shortening on Fridays? He speaks of fast days. All the Fridays of the year are fast days.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. No; I did not mean to do that.

Rev. Dr. VINTON, of Massachusetts. They ought to be excepted.

Rev. Dr. CORBETT, of Illinois. I ask if this is not new business brought in after the sixteenth day?

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. This was before the Committee when they considered the matter, and is the way I proposed to get at the subject.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. Let me ask whether the gentleman includes Deacons as well as Presbyters?

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. No; I confine it to Presbyters.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. It will not do.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. May I ask the gentleman whether this proposition has ever been introduced into the House?

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. No.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Then it is too late.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I offer this as an amendment to that.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. But it is to go down with that.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I am willing it shall go down with that if you choose. I offer it as an amendment, and that brings it fairly before the House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I do not insist on the point of order, but you cannot bring up a different proposition entirely from the report of the Committee.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. It is not a new proposition; it is in relation to shortening the services, and I put on limitations.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. One is a change of the Constitution, and the other a change of the Prayer-Book. That is the difference.

The PRESIDENT. I think one is a fair amendment to the other.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. I submit it to the House. I do say that when there is set forth and marked out a way to alter the Prayer-Book, for you to go around it and not alter the Prayer-Book at all, but alter the Constitution, and put it in the power of another body to alter the Prayer-Book, is not, according to my idea, the proper course to pursue. Why are different modes prescribed? You try to get around the provision of

the Constitution by altering the Constitution so as to thereby get an alteration of the Prayer-Book.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I wish to ask the Deputy from South Carolina a question : How does this proposed alteration change the Prayer-Book, when we have a limitation which requires all the shortened prayers to be taken out of the Prayer-Book ? There is no change in the Prayer-Book by this report, because where a Presbyter or Bishop is allowed to use a shorter form of prayer, he is limited by the very amendment which says it shall be taken from the Prayer-Book. I therefore do not see the force of the argument of the learned Deputy, that this proposed amendment changes the Prayer-Book at all.

Rev. Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. Is it not intended to be a compilation from the Prayer-Book ?

The PRESIDENT. The Deputy from South Carolina must not be further interrupted.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. What I have to say is that if you can give the power to anybody to alter the Prayer-Book in any other way, it is an evasion of the Constitution. What does your Canon say as to the use of the Prayer-Book when you pass it ? They will tell you that this is the manner of using the Prayer-Book. The difficulty is that the way to use the Prayer-Book is presented here. The fact that you allow these shorter services to be taken out of the Prayer-Book does not affect that at all. You have not even put in here that they shall not add to it. It is true, you have said they may be taken out of the Prayer-Book. That is your Constitutional amendment, but still that does not answer the other objection, that you get at the Prayer-Book by giving a power to this body when you have not tried to alter the Prayer-Book itself. I hope that the next Convention will be defeated in that effort anyhow. But I am very willing to give the shortened services, but I want to give them in the right way.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I have a very few words to say, and I speak in the name of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, being one of them. The learned gentleman who has just resumed his seat is a member of that Committee, and he alone refused to sign this report. I join issue with him as to his position, that you may obtain the desired end, namely, a shortened service for Morning and Evening Prayer, without the Constitution being amended at all, and for this reason : In order to obtain the end as the Constitution now stands, you must prepare that service, *verbatim et literatim*, and send it to the several Dioceses, and only after it has been before the Dioceses three years can the General Convention act upon it and make it a law. For this reason the Committee on Constitutional Amendments proposed this amendment to the Constitution. They saw that there was no time at this session of the General Convention, with the mass of business before it, to prepare that shortened service, and to send it down to the Dioceses, so that at the next General Convention this thing could be consummated, and there were no two opinions in the Committee, and I believe there are no two opinions in the House that it is desirable to attain this end. There was but one mode, therefore, of accomplishing that object at the next General Convention, and that was to propose this amendment to the Constitution. That we had time to do, that we have done.

Now, if that proposition meets the approbation of the two Houses, it can go to the Dioceses, and then next Convention some of your learned clerical gentlemen will come here already prepared to make the proposition and let it be acted upon and passed at once. If you do not pass this constitutional amendment, you cannot attain a shortened service

until six years from now, instead of three. Therefore my learned friend is mistaken in supposing that end can be attained in the same length of time. If we had the shortened service, and could pass upon it at this session, I should agree with him, but we have not got it, nor have we time to prepare it.

Now, where is the danger, I ask, in allowing this House the constitutional privilege of making a shortened service—for that is all the amendment proposes ? It is no general amendment or alteration of the Prayer-Book or Rubrics ; but this House simply desires to make a shortened service, which the Church throughout the entire length and breadth of the country requires. Is my learned friend afraid to trust this House to make that shortened service ? There must be power somewhere ; there must be confidence somewhere. If he cannot trust that to this House, I would like to know to whom he would trust it ; because it is this House that must pass upon it, and when it has acted upon it, it has to be passed upon by the House of Bishops before it can become a law.

I therefore think, with great respect to the source from which the objection to the proposed constitutional amendment emanates, that there is very little in it, and that this House ought to pass upon it.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I move that the amendment presented by the Deputy from South Carolina be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (Rev. Dr. Geer, of New York, in the chair). I do not think it has had a second.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Then the motion is not necessary.

Rev. Mr. GIRALT, of Louisiana. I move that the last clause in the resolution of the Committee, giving the privilege to Dioceses to make this change, be stricken out.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would ask the gentleman to consider exactly what that is. The words are, "or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use." This Convention will authorize it, not the Diocese.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I second the motion to omit the last change in the proposed amendment. I cannot conceive of any circumstances under which it would be desirable for this House to give permission to a Diocese to have a special shortened service. I am in favor of one shortened form for the whole Church being passed upon by this body, if we are going to have anything. It is proposed that this Convention shall have the power to authorize, by Canon, any Diocese to put forth a shortened service for its own use. I do not think they ever would do it, and therefore I see no necessity for having this last clause retained in the proposed amendment. I have no doubt the Bishops will strike it out if we do keep it in.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I hope this amendment will not prevail. We all agree there ought to be shortened services. What the learned Deputy from Wisconsin says I heartily endorse. I live in a State which is one of the oldest of the new States, I believe the second admitted into the Union, and there are nine or ten counties where an Episcopal Bishop, Priest, or Deacon has never put his foot. Look at this Church. Do gentlemen want to bind her hand and foot ? Look at the Dioceses bounding upon the Indian frontier, and where is this Church, the instrumentality of so much good ? Are those Missionary Bishops and Diocesan Bishops to have no discretion ?

The Clerical Deputy from New Jersey says that he does not want to leave it to the power of the Diocese. Sir, I am amazed at such an enunciation. Is he afraid to trust a Bishop or a Diocese, or is the

Prayer-Book to become such an idol that it shall be said that the Prayer-Book was not made for man, but man for the Prayer-Book? Which is it? I trust we shall cling to this Prayer-Book. This Constitutional amendment does not propose to touch it, and the provision is that every form of service shall be taken from the Prayer-Book; but let us accommodate this Church to the demands of the times. If the use of these shortened services in the estimation of the Diocesan Bishop will be productive of good, let us allow it. That is my idea, and there is no danger in it.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Let me add one word to what the Deputy from Kentucky has said. He has mentioned the Indians. I live in a country where another class of population exists, the proper service for which we may find to be best adjudged by the Diocese itself, and I urge that their claims on this Convention be not forgotten.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I am very glad indeed to hear one change in this direction proposed, for ever since I have been here I have heard nothing but the whistle, "Down brakes." From the very beginning of this Convention we have been putting on the brakes, and I was very glad to hear my friend from Kentucky whistle another quaver. It is really encouraging to me to hope that I have been in this Convention long enough to find one practical thing brought up. It is a mere question whether we shall sanction it or not. I do think these Dioceses, with the Prayer-Book in their hands, can be trusted with their Bishops.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. This report presents a very important question for our consideration, which is new to me to a certain extent. So far as the leading idea is concerned, as to giving the Convention power by Canon to provide for shortened services, I have as yet not made up my own mind. My inclination is to go in favor of it; but giving the Dioceses that right is entirely a different question, and unless their amendment prevails, striking out that clause, I shall certainly go against the whole of it, and I believe that the feeling of the House will be in the same direction. Therefore, I call upon the friends of the leading idea to vote to strike this out, if they wish to save the whole measure. Otherwise, the whole will be lost. I only judge of others by my own feeling, not committed at all to the matter, but as it strikes me on first presentation.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. One word more, if you please. Let the Convention remember that this does not fix to whom this power is to be given, but only that the power is to be placed in the hands of this Convention to decide at the next meeting how it is to be done. Perhaps I did not express myself sufficiently explicitly just now when I referred to the colored population of the Southern States. I entreat you at least to reserve the power to leave it to the Dioceses. In that country a great deal has to be done by this Church. We do not yet see our way; we are trying to feel and find our way; and if you withhold that power from us, you may shut the door upon the things that we so much seek for. To us who live among that population, and who know them, it is apparent that there should be something left in the way of discretion to the Diocese. Therefore, I ask you only to leave the power, to be judged of at the next Convention. Reasons may be given for it, and reasons may be given against it; but I tell you it is a serious consideration to us, and on that ground I ask you to retain it.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I only want to say, Mr. President and gentlemen, that perhaps it will make the matter a little more clear if it is remembered that in the English Church they were in

the same situation that we are. They had a Prayer-Book, and they had these long services. They, too, felt the need of shortened services, and what did they do? Did they go to work and try to alter the Prayer-Book by Rubric, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McCrady] proposes? No; they simply amended their Act of Uniformity, and having amended the Act of Uniformity, then the shortened services were legal. So what we propose to do is not to amend the Prayer-Book, but to amend that which corresponds to the English Act of Uniformity, namely, our Constitution.

And now let me say one word with respect to the other thing. It is not proposed, at this time, to give this power to the Dioceses; it is only proposed to put it in the power of this Convention to give that authority to the Dioceses at some future time, if it thinks proper. The whole question of whether it is best or not to give it to the Dioceses may be debated at some future time. So I say, let us pass this Constitutional Amendment just as it has come to us, and then we shall have the power of making shortened services, and then the question will remain open yet whether we shall give it to the Dioceses or not. Therefore let us pass this, and leave the question which the Deputy from Pittsburgh speaks of to be settled when it comes before us at the proper time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I do not propose to occupy more than a moment. If I understand the last clause of this report, it authorizes, when adopted as part of the Constitution, the General Convention to confer not upon all Dioceses generally but upon any particular Diocese it pleases, the authority to use such shortened services as it may advise. But, Mr. President, we must remember that the danger of this thing is very trifling when it is qualified by the rule that they shall use nothing but what is in the Book of Common Prayer. They shall add nothing to it whatever. They are to be bound entirely by the Book of Common Prayer; and where is the danger of giving the power to this General Convention to authorize a Diocese on the frontier, which needs peculiar services adapted to its peculiar population, or a Diocese which is composed of a major portion of ignorant colored people, to select from the Book of Common Prayer by its Convention such services as it thinks peculiarly adapted to their locality and people, if they desire?

Mr. President, there is no trenching upon the Prayer-Book here. Many men of sound mind believe even that it could be done without any amendment of the Constitution. They doubt whether it be an alteration of the Prayer-Book to take the services and arrange them in a different form or leave out some. Reading it here, I at first thought it did not require any amendment of the Prayer-Book, but I am persuaded that the words "no alteration shall be made" except in this way would require that we should not alter the form of Morning Service even by omitting a single paragraph without this process of amendment. But I say that the danger apprehended is imaginary. It is feared, first, that this Convention, representing, as it does, the entire Church, will give that power when it ought not to. The second distrust is that if this Convention do give a particular Diocese, having special needs, that special power, it will not exercise it discreetly. Now, it seems to me this is over-carefulness. We may safely trust to this great principle, that the Prayer-Book itself being unaltered and every prayer remaining the same, we may safely give to a Diocese the privilege of selecting such prayers as on special occasions shall be suited to special people and special audiences.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. The ques-

tion on laying my proposition on the table has not yet been voted on. Let that be done.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I do not think your proposition had a second.

Mr. McCRADY, of South Carolina. It was seconded.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I understood that proposition was not seconded. Since then I am informed it was, and I therefore renew my motion to lay the amendment of the Lay Deputy from South Carolina on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question now is on the amendment offered by Rev. Dr. Farrington, of New Jersey, to strike out these words: "Or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use."

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I earnestly hope those words may not be stricken out. That is the very thing in the resolution which commends itself to me. I will take it without that if I cannot get it with it, but I desire that particularly, because it seems to be going back to primitive usage. You would not find in ancient times forty or fifty Dioceses all with precisely the same use. Bishops had then some power. The Primitive Church was willing to trust its chief officers, and never suffered harm in so doing; and if the needs of different Dioceses vary, why should we not be willing to meet those wants? The wants of South Carolina are entirely different from the wants of the Diocese of New York. Why not recognize such a fact in our legislation? I earnestly trust, therefore, that we will keep this clause in, simply because we are following the safeguard of primitive custom, and are recognizing the universal use of the early Church.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If that prevails the resolution remains as it was originally proposed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question now arises on agreeing with the Committee in their resolution, and I am instructed that the vote must be taken by orders.

Rev. Dr. CADY, of New York. I move that the vote of each Diocese be given by some Deputy selected as the name of the Diocese is called, which will avoid the calling of the names of individual members.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That course will be pursued, if there be no objection.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. Let the Secretary read the proposition.

The Secretary read the resolution of the Committee.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. Does that include Sundays or not?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. It does not say anything about Sundays.

Rev. Dr. SPALDING, of Pittsburgh. Does this proposition say anything about Sunday services?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. It leaves this Convention by Canon to do as it pleases.

The Assistant Secretary (Rev. Dr. Williams, of Georgia) proceeded to call the list of Dioceses, and was interrupted by—

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. There is a misunderstanding about a single point, and I wish to have the report read so that gentlemen can understand it. It is said positively by some members

that there is a restriction in this proposition with regard to Sunday services, and certain festivals of the Church. I did not understand that to be in the report, and I would like to have it read.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. There is nothing of the sort in it.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. It is in the power of the Convention at any time.

The Secretary read the resolution as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following be proposed and made known to the several Dioceses as an amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution, to be added at the end of the article as it now stands—to wit, the words, 'Provided, That the General Convention may, by Canon, arrange and set forth a shortened form of Morning and Evening Prayer, to be compiled only from the Book of Common Prayer, or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use.'"

Rev. Dr. HASKINS, of Long Island. I can never give my vote "aye" on that.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama (having voted in the affirmative). Alabama changes its vote, and votes "nay."

The Secretary resumed and concluded the call of the Dioceses, with the following result:

CLERICAL VOTE.—*Aye*—Albany, Arkansas, California, Central New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Easton, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin—37. *Nay*—Alabama, New Jersey, Pittsburgh, Texas—4. *Divided*—Central Pennsylvania—1.

LAY VOTE.—*Aye*—Albany, California, Central New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Easton, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Long Island, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Western New York, Wisconsin—25. *Nay*—New Jersey, Pittsburgh, South Carolina—3. *Divided*—New York—1.

So the resolution was agreed to.

PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I now beg leave to offer the next report, and the last, I am happy to say, from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution.

The report was read as follows:

"The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, to whom were referred memorials and other papers presenting the question of the expediency of devising a "Provincial System for the Church," having had the same under consideration, respectfully report:

"1. Your Committee assume that the terms 'provincial system' are used in the resolution in their full ecclesiastical and primitive sense. In the early Church there were: 1, the Parish; 2, the Diocese; 3, the Province; 4, the Patriarchate. The Parish had its Priest, the Diocese its Bishop, the Province its Archbishop, the Patriarchate its Patriarch. Among these, the dominant and most active power was the Province, with its Archbishop. Speaking generally, we may say that it possessed the powers of this body and of the House of Bishops, and many of the powers of our Diocesan Councils. The Provinces were disconnected and independent, except as, by very slender ties, they were united in the Patriarchate. Such a system would dismember this Church, and out of this now compact, and now united body, create five, or seven, or ten separate Churches. The ties which

might at first unite them would grow weaker and weaker. However similar they might be at the moment of dismemberment, at that moment the process of divergence would begin, and would go on until the separation would be as great as that now existing between York and Canterbury. Those Provinces now communicate with each other only informally. At the preliminary and very important Lambeth Conference, the Bishops of York did not attend, because it was convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury. If the words "Province" and "Provincial System" mean anything, they mean all this.

"If these terms, as used in the resolution, do not have as broad a signification as that given them above, it is respectfully submitted that they ought not to be used. Having a well-defined signification in the nomenclature of Church polity, their use in another sense must create confusion and misconception.

"2. The unity and unexampled prosperity now enjoyed by the Church is mainly to be attributed, under Divine Providence, to its simple but efficient organization under one supreme authority in the General Convention, restrained only by the Ecclesiastical Constitution established by the piety and forecast of our fathers.

"No fundamental change should be made in that organization without the clearest evidence of urgent necessity, and then only in the constitutional mode, by carefully prepared amendments to the Constitution, proposed and passed by the General Convention, to be submitted to the clergy and laity in each of the Dioceses for their due consideration, before its second passage in the next General Convention.

"4. In framing or enlarging the organization of the Apostolic Church in the United States of America, as one great province of the Church Catholic, there was not, nor is there now, any Scriptural or other necessity for adopting or following any example of local organization in any other country or age. The Church, in any of the nations of Christendom, is fully and plainly at liberty at all times to conform its local organization to its local conditions and necessities.

"5. No evidence has yet been furnished by experience of any action or want of action by the General Convention of the Church in the United States, which requires any large surrender or delegation of its powers to provinces, or groups of Dioceses, representing only separate portions of the Church.

"6. Any such surrender, practically establishing independent Churches, must eventually and inevitably operate to undermine and overthrow the paramount authority of the General Convention, vitally necessary for preserving the unity of the Church.

"7. In view of the continental extent of the Church, already reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and requiring personal supervision of its widespread subdivisions, the present House of Bishops is not too numerous, but may be gradually and wisely increased in number to keep pace with the growth of the Church.

"8. If the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies should hereafter become too numerous for convenient and efficient action, the evil may be promptly remedied without any fundamental change in the character of our ecclesiastical structure, by constitutional amendments from time to time reducing the number of Deputies from each of the Dioceses whenever rendered necessary by their increase in number.

"9. No intermediate provinces are needed for exercising any powers already possessed by the Diocesan Conventions, while any other powers granted to provinces must necessarily be subtracted from the General Convention, which would be thereby enfeebled to the same extent.

"10. Any institution of provinces, or Provincial Synods, with powers subject at all times to revocation by the General Convention, would be useless and illusory. The Provinces, if invested with irrevocable powers, and discharged from the constant and necessary authority and supervision of the General Convention, certainly might, and probably would, soon diverge into widely differing practices and opinions, engendering ecclesiastical conflicts, threatening the unity of our Church.

"11. Apart from these fearful consequences in the future, reaching far down the coming ages, the separation of our Church into geographical and sectional provinces would work immediate injury in discontinuing or rendering less frequent the General Conventions (now triennial) of the Bishops, and the representatives of the Clergy and Laity, in which fraternal assemblies the efforts of all to advance the highest interests of the Church, and especially its widespread missionary labors, are encouraged and invigorated, thereby more closely uniting our now undivided Church in a perpetual bond of Christian sympathy and affection.

"Fully impressed with the convictions now expressed, the Committee recommend the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That, in the judgment of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, it is not expedient to establish a provincial system for this Church.

"CHAS. H. HALL, Chairman,

Clerical Deputy from Diocese of Long Island.

J. A. DUDLEY, JR.,

Clerical Deputy from Diocese of Maryland.

BENJAMIN A. ROGERS,

Clerical Deputy from Diocese of Texas.

SAMUEL B. RUGGLES,

Lay Deputy from New York.

J. W. STEVENSON,

Lay Deputy from Kentucky.

GEO. F. COMSTOCK,

Lay Deputy from Central New York.

W. F. BULLOCK,

Lay Deputy from Kentucky.

G. W. RICE,

Lay Deputy from Louisiana.

E. T. WILDER,

Lay Deputy from Minnesota.

EDMUND H. BENNETT,

Lay Deputy from Massachusetts.

ISAAC HAZLEHURST,

Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the resolution appended to the report.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I know the House is tired, and hardly prepared to listen to what I have to say, but I must say a few words. I object to the resolution because it states something which is not borne out by the report.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Before Dr. De Koven begins his speech, I would like to move an amendment to the resolution.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I have a motion to make about it, and that would spoil my motion.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Certainly, if you have a motion of your own to make, but I give notice of the amendment I intend to offer.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I was going to say the Committee have found a windmill and have tilted against it and overthrown it. What they have overthrown is a windmill. There are two ideas of a provincial system which have been in this Church. The first is the grouping together of certain Dioceses and States, making, for instance, a province of the Atlantic, a province of the Pacific, a province of the Gulf, and a province of some other place, and giving them to Archbishops, and so forming a great hierarchy.

That is the theory of a provincial system, the dangers of which are put down in this report, and therefore, because of these dangers, it is proposed "that, in the judgment of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, it is not expedient to establish a provincial system for this Church."

I agree with those views. I have nothing whatever to say in behalf of a provincial system such as is spoken against in this report. But if you pass this resolution, it is to condemn all ideas of a provincial system, and I think this General Convention has had now, for no less than six years, a definite idea before it, on which it has acted, and in relation to which all its action on this subject has heretofore been determined. The idea of a provincial system had been in the minds of certain Bishops; amongst others, the late Bishop of Western New York, whom we all remember with honor, and whose zeal, and discretion, and wisdom are still revered by all who knew him. That idea was constantly presented by him to the House of Bishops; and in the time of the war the Confederate States, in forming their Constitution, got up the idea of a provincial system, and proposed that any two Dioceses could have the power of forming a federation for this purpose. In consequence, in the year 1865, after the war, when the General Convention met together, straightway there was a variety of proposals with regard to the provincial system, and when those proposals came up they were in two forms. One was this: That this report goes against a variety of provinces. The other was the idea of a federation of Dioceses within the limits of a single State. These two ideas came out prominently, and they were referred to a Committee of 17, of which Rev. Dr. Mahan, of Maryland, was Chairman; and that Committee, in 1865, brought in a Canon which was in effect pretty much the same as the Canon on federate councils now found in our Digest. But though that Canon was passed by the House of Deputies, it did not receive the approval of the House of Bishops, and so it did not become a law.

But the subject did not drop. It was proposed again, and the second time it was with this other idea of a collection of States forming a province, and that was referred to a Committee in 1868. There was a very learned report on the subject of provinces, favoring the idea which is spoken against in this report, which was presented in this House by Rev. Dr. Mahan. That report came before the House, and we simply proposed that the alteration of the Constitution and Canons necessary to bring it into effect should be referred to another Committee, and in 1868, such a Committee was appointed, of which the Rev. Dr. Mulcahey was Chairman. Their report is to be found in the Appendix to the Journal of 1868, and they proposed two Canons, one entitled "Authorizing the Formation of a Federate Convention or Council of the Dioceses within any State," and the second, "Of Provincial Synods." I want to read those two Canons to this House. The first Canon was :

"It is hereby declared lawful for the Dioceses now existing or hereafter to exist within the limits of any State or Commonwealth to establish for themselves a Federate Convention or Council representing such Dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits aforesaid, and enact any laws not inconsistent with the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention and the Book of Common Prayer.

"The Bishop of the original See, with the consent of a majority of the Bishops of the said Dioceses,

shall call the Primary Federate Convention, and shall be the Presiding Bishop thereof."

The second Canon was :

"Of Provincial Synods.

"1. Whenever the several Dioceses in any State or Commonwealth shall have established for themselves a Federate Convention, the said State or Commonwealth shall constitute an Ecclesiastical Province; and the said Convention shall be known as the Provincial Synod of the Church therein.

"2. The Provincial Synod shall consist of two co-ordinate Houses; the Upper including all the Bishops within the limits aforesaid; and the Lower being composed of clergy and laity from each Diocese within the same.

"3. Each Diocese shall be entitled to send one Clerical and one Lay Deputy to the Synod; and, besides these, one additional Clerical Deputy for every ten clergymen having parochial charge in the Diocese, and an equal number of Lay Deputies.

"4. The exclusive power of making and altering Constitutions and Canons, subject to those of the General Convention, shall be vested in the Provincial Synod, except that the Convention or Convocation of each Diocese may enact such Rules and Regulations as pertain merely to the local interests of the same.

"5. The Bishops of the Province, when they are not less than three in number, acting under such Rules, and with such Assessors as the Synod may enact, shall be a Court of final resort, to hear and decide appeals in all matters ecclesiastical, brought before them from any Diocese within the Province."

Those Canons were presented to this House. They simply embodied the idea of a confederation of Dioceses within a State, and were made especially with a view to the Dioceses of New York and Pennsylvania, then, I believe, the only States that had more than one Diocese, and they were presented to this Convention. The Convention had a very long debate over it, considered the matter very carefully, and finally the present Canon on Federate Councils, Canon 8 of Title III., if not altered—it is in the Digest of 1868—was adopted, as follows:

"Authorizing the Formation of a Federate Convention or Council, of the Dioceses within any State.

"It is hereby declared lawful for the Dioceses now existing, or hereafter to exist, within the limits of any State or Commonwealth, to establish for themselves a Federate Convention or Council, representing such Dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits aforesaid, but before any determinate action of such Convention or Council shall be had, the powers proposed to be exercised thereby shall be submitted to the General Convention for its approval.

"Nothing in this Canon shall be construed as forbidding any Federate Council from taking such action as they may deem necessary to secure such legislative enactments as the common interests of the Church in the State may require."

In other words, the Canon that was passed embodied the idea of the provincial system within the limits of a single State, known as the federation of Dioceses within that State. That was passed by the Convention in 1868. Nobody can have been present at this Convention, and the previous one of 1871, without realizing that the two conditions may be said to have had a somewhat reactionary tendency.

In 1871 the federate council of the Diocese of New York, acting under this Canon, sent up to this Convention a series of powers, asking that those powers be granted. They are to be found on the fifty-

fourth page of the Journal of the Convention. I need not read the declaration of powers all through. The only thing of any importance was—

“3. To the establishment of an appellate court, to which, under the Canons of any particular Diocese, appeal may be made from the decision of any Diocesan court in said State.”

In other words, the Federate Council of the State of New York, including no less than five Dioceses acting directly under this Canon, asked for certain powers, and amongst others the power of having a court of appeal in the State of New York. The Convention debated over it, and finally laid it on the table on the ground that the Federate Council of the State of New York had the power to do all this thing without any such resolution on the part of this Convention, whereas the Canon says expressly that they must ask the approval of this Convention. They sent up and asked for that approval, and when they asked for it it was laid on the table on the ground that they did not need to have any such approval; and what has been the consequence?

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Is the gentleman quoting from the Convention Journal that that was the ground?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. No, sir.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Or is it an opinion?

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. The ground is here, and I will read it.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. The decision, I understand, was that it was in the power of any one of the Dioceses of New York to form a Court of Appeals, and the others could unite with it if they chose, but not that the Federate Council as such had that power.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I have the resolution here:

“Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the General Convention doth hereby approve such of the powers proposed to be exercised by the Federate Council of the State of New York, as are set forth in the sections 1 and 2 of Article I, and in Article 2 of the Declaration of Powers submitted for the approval of the General Convention; but doth decline to approve Section 3 of Article I of the said Declaration of Powers, for the reason that Article 6 of the Constitution confers upon each Diocese in said State the power to institute the mode of trying Presbyters and Deacons therein, including a Court of Appeals, if such Diocese elects to institute such tribunal for itself; and whether such Appellate Court shall also be the Appellate Court of any other of the Dioceses in said State, is a matter of discretion and concurrent choice on the part of the Conventions of such other Dioceses respectively. But the approval of powers hereby given is upon the express condition that the regulations proposed to be enacted, as suggested in Article 2 of the Declaration of Powers aforesaid, shall be accepted and approved by the Conventions of all the Dioceses in said State; and it is hereby further declared that the General Convention doth hereby reserve to itself the right to withdraw the approval of powers hereby given at its pleasure.”

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The gentleman's time has expired.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the Deputy be allowed to go on.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. It is evident that the Convention felt that the Federate Council of the State of New York could form such Court of Appeals, nevertheless.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. Allow me to interrupt the gentleman. The position taken by the Convention was that it was within the power of any one Diocese to establish a Court of Appeals,

to which either or all the other Dioceses might attach themselves if they saw proper, but not to give the Federate Council that power.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Yes, I understand. The point I was going to come at was this: With that peculiar feeling which I think belongs to all our Conventions, it is very evident that the Federate Council of the State of New York wanted to get the approval of the General Convention before it did anything, even though it seemed as though it had that right. Now I come to my argument. The Convention did not grant this request. The result was that the Federate Council of the State of New York has never met since. It squelched, it killed it dead. It wanted certain powers. The Convention told it that it had those powers. Probably the members of the various Dioceses were not quite sure on the subject, but at any rate the result was that the Federate Council, for the time being, ceased to exist.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. It only sleeps.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Allow me as I made the motion to extend the gentleman's time to make one statement more. That was not the reason why the Federate Council of New York went to sleep; but in the only meeting we had, the Bishop of Long Island moved that that Council adjourn *sine die*; I amended the motion that we should adjourn to meet at the call of the Bishop of New York. The idea was prevalent that having simply made this motion the Federate Council went out of existence, became nothing; and it was with great difficulty I could persuade those about me to vote for the motion to adjourn to meet at the call of the President, in order, at any rate, to continue the ghost of an existence.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. That is just it; it was the ghost of an existence [laughter], and having only that sort of thing, it did not think it worth while to be revived in any way. The point of my argument is this, that the whole legislation of our Convention, as far as it has gone, has been in favor of a provincial system when that provincial system is regarded as a federation of Dioceses within a single State; it has been against any confederation of States making up an artificial provincial system; and our whole legislation has been heretofore in favor of a steady, natural, and regular growth. Now, I am opposed to any artificial provincial system. I am in favor of a natural provincial system coming in the regular order of our growth; and for this reason (and the thing is worth the consideration of this Convention), there are certain things which this Church needs to do which never can be done by a solitary Diocese. Take that great question on which we have regularly the report of a Standing Committee every Convention, and which we never do anything about, because we cannot—the great question of Christian Education.

There never can be in our Church any real, true, noble Church college except it be supported by more than a single Diocese. It must have at least the command and the support of one whole State. And let me say, that the one thing which recommends, I believe, that new and rising institution in the South to the minds of churchmen is the fact that the Bishops of the Southern Church have organized, as it were, in this respect, a provincial system, and ten Bishops have united together to support a great university.

There are a variety of other things besides Christian education, for I believe it will be found that there are just three things in which this Church needs organization. It needs the organization of its laymen. It needs to teach them that no man who is not a member of this Church has a right to

do anything in the way of its legislation. It needs to organize the power and work of its Bishops and cathedrals, and it needs to organize the work of its Dioceses in a federation in each State.

Therefore, I trust that this House will do nothing which will seem to imply that we do not mean in due time to have a provincial system, however much people may object to that artificial provincial system, which possibly is open to the great objections which have been mentioned in this report, and which my co-Deputy from Wisconsin brought forth in a speech the other day.

I therefore move, inasmuch as I suppose it is impossible for this House to do anything now, that we do not pass this resolution, but that we lay it on the table. I move that the resolution, "That, in the judgment of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, it is not expedient to establish a Provincial System for this Church," be laid on the table.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. We ought to have an opportunity to answer this argument. Are we to be choked down in this way? I ask five minutes.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I am quite willing to withdraw my motion to allow Mr. Ruggles to be heard.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I am sorry the task has not fallen to a person having more physical strength. I must be very brief. The gentleman from Wisconsin has missed the whole question entirely. What he wants is a system of thirty federate councils. We have no great objection to enlarging the federate council, though we thought it a very feeble and sickly child at the best. Federal councils are liable to the fundamental objection of the provincial system, to wit: that no intermediate body is necessary between the Dioceses and the General Convention. Whatever may be the real working power of those intermediate bodies, that is the objection to them. No such bodies are needed. What power is not exercised at home in the Diocese, should be reserved to this body. We have tried the Federate Council in this State. That measure has been allowed to be tried, but it has led to no practical result. It has shown that it is of no efficacy or usefulness whatever. The only power of any sort of consequence was to make a Court of Appeals. It is now a conceded fact that you cannot find unity among the five Bishops. The moment you put them together, they fall apart. I have heard them all talk on the subject. It is an utterly useless fiction. It is the most wretched bantling that was ever produced. It is of no possible use whatever. It died still-born. It perished on the spot. That is the windmill the gentleman from Wisconsin has talked about.

He says we are reactionary, that we have been amused, misled, deceived by an imaginary idea of a system of Archbishops and Patriarchs. I want to resist its initiation. Such a system is entirely inapplicable to our great continent, extending from ocean to ocean.

My friend from Wisconsin is for a federate system. I say it is impossible to build anything on such an imaginary basis. It perished by its own debility. But I do make war on this great Provincial system, which takes power from this General Convention and organizes Dioceses together according to sections. It can work only for schism. It is a dangerous system. If you make these provinces of any value, they must be dangerous to us in the United States. But I hope we shall not be deluded by any such scheme. I ask you to let it alone. Do not touch it.

Mr. WILDER, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President and gentlemen, I will not detain you more than two or three minutes. I do not intend to engage in an

argument on this proposition, but I am desirous that you shall understand, as clearly as I can make you understand, the position of this Committee, and I wish to say, in the first place, that I and this Committee, so far as I understand the Committee, regard the provincial system, which was the subject matter referred to us, just as unlike the question of a confederation of Dioceses comprised within the geographical limits of a State, as one thing can be unlike another.

What was it that was referred to this Committee on Constitutional Amendments? The first paragraph in this report shows: "The Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to whom were referred memorials and other papers presenting the question of the expediency of devising a 'Provincial System for the Church.'" What is the provincial system as it is understood throughout the length and breadth of this land? It is the organization of four or five or half a dozen provinces, comprising in those four, five, or half a dozen the whole territory of the United States. It is that system which we believe to be unwise—if I am not mistaken, a conclusion on which this Committee unanimously agreed.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina. No; I beg pardon.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I withdraw the assertion; but we did not touch, nor did we intend to touch, because it was not referred to us, nor did we discuss or examine, except by an incidental remark now and then, the question of the confederation of Dioceses for certain local purposes, within certain limits, in the same State. It is the other, the more comprehensive, and in our judgment the dangerous thing at which this report is aimed, and at nothing else. It may be that this matter of the confederation of Dioceses within the territorial limits of a State may have within itself vital power and vital energy. I am inclined to think, notwithstanding I differ from my senior—senior in every respect, and superior in every respect—the gentleman who first preceded me, that there is vitality, there is wholesome power, there is an energy that can be made practically available in several directions in the confederation of Dioceses within the geographical limits of a State, but that is not the provincial system, and the fact that this confederation in the State of New York has substantially or literally died the death is not—

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. It sleepeth.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I say, substantially or literally, died the death, or gone to sleep, if you please, is not, in my judgment, any good, or substantial, or sufficient reason to induce me to believe that there is not vital energy in that matter of confederation. I believe that the Diocese of Wisconsin, now divided, may develop a Confederation of the two Dioceses that will, in a few days, be comprised within itself elements that will enable that Diocese to the certain parts of its work better combined and federated; and the fact that it failed in New York, to my mind, is not conclusive evidence that it is necessarily and inherently a weakness. But what I desire to insist upon, and have every gentleman here understand, is that the provincial system is one thing, and that was referred to us, and nothing else, and the confederation of Dioceses within a State is another thing, with which we have not dealt.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. If members will look around they will see what a House we have deliberating on a large question. Some of us have something to say on this matter. I only want to say now that I see distinctions made between the confederation of Dioceses within a State and outside. I had the idea that in this Church State lines did not exist, and that there might

be grounds upon which we might speak of Dioceses as existing only in the Church, and not in this State or that State; but perhaps I am wrong. At all events, what I mean to say now is, that it is a very large question, and I appeal to gentlemen whether the members now present are sufficient to justify us in voting upon it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. We are only going to act to do nothing.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I merely move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Very well; I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I move to substitute an indefinite postponement.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I will accept that. You cannot move a substitute for a motion to lay on the table. I accept that in lieu of my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion now is to postpone the whole question indefinitely.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. If that is debatable, I have a few words to say. ["Order! Order!"]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is debatable.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I will say a few words. Judge Wilder, in my opinion, is perfectly right. This idea that was before the Committee was simply and solely the idea of putting a quantity of States together artificially in a so-called system. That is the sole thing that was before them, and that is what Judge Wilder condemns, and what this Convention condemns. Now I will say that the idea that is before Judge Wilder's mind, and before Dr. De Koven's mind, is the idea of a Confederation of Sees within a State, which idea I claim is vital, although it has gone asleep in the State of New York. I am perfectly content, having made this explanation, to take choice of what the House does, either to indefinitely postpone it, or to pass the resolution that is brought before us by the Committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion to postpone indefinitely.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move to lay the whole subject on the table. That takes precedence.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

On motion the House adjourned till Monday at nine A.M.

TWENTY-THIRD DAY.

MONDAY, November 2.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. Samuel M. Haskins, D.D., of Long Island. The Lessons were read by Rev. Christopher S. Lefingwell, of Maine. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. George Leeds, D.D., of Maryland, who also pronounced the Benediction.

The minutes of the proceedings of Saturday last were read and approved.

CHURCH MUSIC.

The PRESIDENT appointed Rev. Dr. Beach, of New York, in place of Rev. Dr. Benedict, of Georgia, upon the Committee of Conference in reference to the Canon "Of Church Music."

STANDARD BIBLE.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Joint Committee to examine the proof-sheets of the proposed standard Bible be continued."

MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina, presented the following report:

"The Committee on Canons have had under consideration a resolution proposing that, in case of nominations to the House of Deputies of Missionary Bishops, the House of Bishops shall nominate to the House of Deputies two persons for the office, and that a majority of the Deputies of each order shall be necessary to an election, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution proposing to amend Subsection 1 of Section 9, Canon 13, Title I."

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF THE REGISTRAR.

The SECRETARY presented the following report and accompanying resolution:

"The Registrar of the General Convention respectfully reports:

"That in consequence of his removal from his former residence in New Jersey, the various pamphlets, documents and other articles in his charge are at present deposited in different places.

"1. The more valuable documents are in his own apartments in the city of Buffalo.

"2. The pamphlets, etc., are stowed near his former abode in New Jersey.

"3. The gold alms-basin presented by the University of Oxford is deposited in the vaults of the Mechanics' Bank in the city of New York.

"This arrangement will continue but a short time longer, as the entire collection, unless with the exception of the alms-basin, will be gathered and deposited in a safe and accessible place in the village of Geneva, N. Y., with the benefit of the personal supervision of the assistant registrar, the Rev. Dr. Perry.

"The registrar respectfully asks that the treasurer of the Convention be authorized to pay the fee of sixty-seven dollars to the porter of the Mechanics' Bank, for care and service in regard to the alms-basin during six years past. He found, on enquiry, that a compartment in the vaults of a safe deposit company, large enough to contain the alms basin, would cost more than the fee, and therefore put the basin in the hands of the porter of the bank, who has also charge of the Trinity Church plate. Considering the time and responsibility it covers, he deems the fee only reasonable, and asks that it be paid, venturing, should it seem otherwise to the Convention, to suggest that, except in the case of the Book of Record of Consecration of Bishops, this is the only charge for expenses that has been presented by the Registrar during the more than twenty years that he has held the office.

"October, 1874.

J. H. HOBART.

"Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to draw on the Treasurer, so as to pay the charges for the care and keeping of the alms-basin belonging to the General Convention, on the order of the Registrar or his Deputy."

The resolution was agreed to.

LECTIONARY FOR LENT, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Calendar according to the order made on Saturday.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The first business on the Calendar is the report of the Joint Committee to prepare a Lectionary for week days in Lent; and it has been asked that by general consent the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Beach, offered on the 20th day, respecting the proposed Lectionary for week days in Lent, together with the message No. 60 from the House of Bishops, on the same subject, be considered at the same time.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I ask that the message of the House of Bishops be read.

The SECRETARY. Message No. 60 is as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Table of Lessons, reported by the Joint Committee on the Table of Lessons for week days in Lent, be authorized for use until the next General Convention; provided, the same shall be approved by the Bishop of each Diocese or missionary district respectively.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Joint Committee be continued in charge of this matter for its more thorough consideration, and to afford opportunity for such improvements as may be suggested by its actual use.

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Table of Lessons for the Ember and Rogation days presented herewith be authorized for use on the same conditions as the Table of Lessons for Lent."

When the message was received, Rev. Dr. Beach, of New York, offered the following resolution, as a substitute, which was placed on the Calendar:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Lectionary for week days in Lent, reported by the Joint Committee on that subject, together with that for the Rogation and Ember Days, presented by the same Committee, is hereby proposed as an addition in the Prayer-Book, and that it be made known by the Secretary of this body to the Convention of every Diocese of this Church, in accordance with the provision of Article VIII. of the Constitution, as matter for final action at the next General Convention."

Mr. BURGIN, of Pittsburgh. Is that word "addition"?

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. The word "addition" is used so that the lessons in the Prayer-Book may also be used. This is an alternative.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Do I understand that the resolutions of the House of Bishops give us leave, if we pass them, to use these Lessons until the next General Convention; whereas, if we pass Dr. Beach's resolution, it is obliged to go down to the different conventions, and must be acted upon at the next General Convention?

The SECRETARY. You are right, sir.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I therefore move that the resolution of the Deputy from New York be laid on the table, if it is before us, in order that we may take up the resolutions of the House of Bishops.

Mr. BURGIN, of Pittsburgh. I hope the gentleman will not make that motion, because there is a difficulty about adopting the resolutions of the House of Bishops as being unconstitutional.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I will withdraw the motion in order that that may properly be discussed.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I would much prefer myself the resolutions which have come to us from the House of Bishops, because they would relieve us at once; but as I understand it, this, as an addition to the Prayer-Book, has to take a certain course under the Eighth Article of our Constitution. Therefore I offer this as a substitute. I presume the reso-

lutions came from the House of Bishops through oversight.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. What will be the effect of this resolution of Dr. Beach's?

The PRESIDENT. It is an amendment of the Constitution adopted here, for the present, provisionally, sent down to the Dioceses, and to be ratified at the next General Convention. If the next General Convention should choose to do so, then it becomes an alteration of the Constitution, not before, and it becomes also under that article of the Constitution an addition to the Prayer-Book to the Calendar of Lessons.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. I move the adoption of the resolution of the Deputy from New York.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I understand that constitutionally we cannot adopt the resolutions of the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. That seems to be the general sense of the House.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. May I call attention to the provision made in the present Lectionary that on certain days of fasting and prayer it is made competent that certain lessons may be provided? I do not suppose it was the intention of the Church in making this preface to provide for Lent, but the question is whether liberal provision is not made, and whether we cannot obtain the use of this Lectionary at once. I say I do not believe that was the intention; I only call the attention of the Convention to it, in order that they may weigh that liberty well in voting upon this question.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I think that it is safer that we should go properly to work. It is one way to do a thing properly, and another way to do it by a side blow. Let us take the proper course.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. The only difficulty about passing the resolution of the Deputy from New York is this: This is the last day of the session. It is an amendment to the Constitution or to the Prayer-Book. I do not know which. It will go up to the House of Bishops, and there are ninety-nine chances to one hundred that they will not concur, that it will pass over, and so we shall get no Lectionary. Now I hope I may be able to call still more definitely the attention of the House to the remarks of the Deputy from North Carolina. There is a Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer which permits the Bishops to put forth special lessons for fast days; and though it is true that probably in the intention of that Rubric it was not meant to apply to Lent days, nevertheless it certainly is not wrong to interpret the Rubric in its plain, literal sense. And if that be so, the resolutions sent down to us by the House of Bishops for our concurrence are simply the expression of their determination to set forth lessons for certain fast days.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. But the Rubric refers to each Bishop of a Diocese.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. In that respect the resolutions leave it to the Dioceses to approve. The resolutions of the House of Bishops provide for that. Simply they express the opinion that the Bishop of a Diocese has a right to do what this Rubric in the Prayer-Book permits him to do; and therefore this Constitutional objection, which I believe is a very serious one in this Rubric as in any other, I think we can honestly and fairly get over on the principle of a liberal interpretation of the Rubrics.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Let me read the Rubric:

"And, on days of fasting and thanksgiving, appointed either by the civil or by the ecclesiastical authority"—

Not by the regular order of the Prayer-Book, but

days appointed either by the Bishop or by the Governor—on such days the Psalter is presented one way. Now, Now down :

"And, on days of fasting and thanksgiving, the same rule is to obtain as in reading the Psalms."

That is, on days of fasting and thanksgiving appointed by the civil or ecclesiastical authority. Those are special days, not days set down in the ordinary Calendar of the year. We cannot, under these Rubrics, make that change. It is on special days, as it always has been interpreted, and never on the days of Lent or the Ember days. It is simply dodging the language. It is not the fair interpretation of the language, as every one will see on reflection.

I want the Lectionary as such as any man here. I think our present Lectionary in Lent is a terrible burden, continually in our way, and I would be very glad if we could attain this without violating the principles of the Constitution ; but you cannot, under this Constitution, except by two Conventions, alter the Prayer-Book. By the Eighth Article of the Constitution it takes two Conventions to do it. The proposition of Rev. Dr. Beach, it seems to me, is a regular and orderly one ; while there is an insuperable difficulty in the way of the proposition of the Bishops. I move that we non-concur in the message of the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. I suppose the proper way is to pass the resolution of Dr. Beach as an amendment to the resolutions sent down by the House of Bishops.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. That was my motion preceding this.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I offered my resolution as a substitute for the resolution that came to us from the House of Bishops. I do not know but that it will be necessary to move a non-concurrence in the first place.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I ask if there is anything really contradictory in these two propositions. As I understand, there is at the present time a Lectionary which is permitted to be used in the Church of England. Now, why should we not permit the same Lectionary to be used here, under certain restrictions, for the same period of time permitted in the Church of England ? Then, if gentlemen wish permanently to adopt such a Lectionary, why not take the initiatory steps at the present time, in order that this may be done, so that no one who has such wonderful regard for the Constitution can be in any way offended ? We ought to keep, indeed, to the strict letter of the law ; but there is a difference of interpretation in regard to that law. Why may we not adopt the recommendation of the House of Bishops, and if gentlemen wish also to adopt the other, adopt that too ?

The PRESIDENT. The first question is upon the resolution offered by the Deputy from New York.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Do I understand that if we vote now, we vote on this amendment of the Deputy from New York, and that that is an amendment to the message sent down by the House of Bishops ?

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. No ; not an amendment. Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. I should like to ask why the substitute may not be offered as an independent proposition, and let us adopt both ? I do not see any incompatibility.

The PRESIDENT. I do not either ; but the resolution of Dr. Beach is the question before us. After disposing of that, the House can then deal with the message from the House of Bishops as seems proper to itself.

Mr. MASSIE. I suggest to the Deputy that he withdraw his substitute.

The PRESIDENT. Why not pass on that as it is now before the House ?

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. Because I understand he offers it as a substitute for the resolution of the House of Bishops. I want to vote for both.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that we ought to act accordingly to the Constitution.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I suggest that the vote be taken on the resolution of Dr. Beach on its own merits. It is just what we want as the beginning of a constitutional amendment to give us a new Lectionary.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I would prefer the other mode for this reason : Inasmuch as the Bishop's message presents a constitutional difficulty, it will inevitably have to be passed or rejected by a vote by Dioceses and Orders. I would not be satisfied to take a vote upon a constitutional question except in that way. That will take some time, and we have a very thin House. It would not probably represent the Church in Convention to take a vote by Dioceses and orders here now. But the question presented to us is a very simple one. If we adopt Dr. Beach's motion as a substitute for the resolutions of the House of Bishops, it then goes over there, and their concurrence ends the matter ; whereas, in the other way we should have to take two votes on each proposition separately.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. If we vote on the proposition of the House of Bishops to amend the Prayer-Book, we must vote by Dioceses and Orders, because if we vote yea we propose an alteration. Then if we amend the message of the House of Bishops by adopting the substitute proposed by my friend from New York, we shall have to vote upon that proposition as amended, which will be a proposition to alter the Prayer-Book ; and the vote by Dioceses and Orders must come either way ; and it is the simplest form merely to submit this as an amendment to the message of the House of Bishops ; and in that way, if we adopt this amendment, we shall escape the vote by Orders and Dioceses.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. That is my proposition.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I am perfectly satisfied that when the Bishops had this matter in hand (these resolutions were drawn by Bishop Young), they never thought of the constitutional objection or obstruction, and I am perfectly satisfied that the moment their attention is called to it in the way in which I propose, the whole difficulty will be removed and the matter will pass through without any trouble at all.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. The Constitution reads as follows : "No alteration or addition shall be made in the book of Common Prayer," and so on, "until proposed in one general convention and passed in another." If this House unanimously pass upon the act of the Bishops, it is not constitutionally passed then ; it is not the law of the Church then ; we have simply violated the Constitution and accomplished nothing.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I, with very great regret, am obliged to believe that we cannot adopt the resolutions of the House of Bishops without violating Article 8 of the Constitution. With very great regret, I say, I am brought to this conclusion. I think, however, that the resolution of the Reverend Deputy from New York would fail of the whole scope and purport that he himself desires and that all of us would desire. If we now find, on careful examination of this proposed Lenten Lectionary during the next three years, that it does not suit us, then the result would be that we should be obliged three years hence to adopt that Lectionary or none. I do think that the Lectionary ought to be within the power of this Convention, and therefore I would propose, if it is parliamentary and orderly, to substitute for the amendment of the

Reverend Deputy from New York the following, as an addition to Article VIII. of the Constitution :

"Provided, however, that the Lectionary may be changed at any time by the concurrent action of both Houses of General Convention."

In this way if, on examination, the Committee which made up this Lenten Lectionary should become convinced that it is not the best Lectionary, but that another and better one could be presented to us three years hence, we may then adopt that instead of this which has been proposed to us.

It is very necessary that we should get through our work, and I do not wish to speak long on the subject, but I would move this as a substitute for the motion of the Rev. Deputy from New York.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I would respectfully suggest that the gentleman from New York amend his resolution to convey this idea : that a committee of three or six be appointed to receive suggestions, and to propose emendations of this Lectionary, on the idea that the whole Lectionary being presented as a change at the same time, it may be critically amended during the three years as proposed, and at the next General Convention we can act on the Lectionary as then presented by that Committee ; that is, either adopting this one or making in it such corrections as they shall then present.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The only way to reach it is by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama by amending the Constitution as he proposes. I think it would be well to have a committee to revise this Lectionary and report to the next General Convention, but we must adopt it or reject it as a whole.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The order for the Psalter and for the reading of the Holy Scriptures might be amended so as to cover the entire ground, and I think that would suit the views of members on all sides. I agree, after reflection, that this change in the order of services cannot be made without an amendment to the Constitution. In the order for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, this clause occurs :

"And the same discretion of choice is allowed on occasions of Ecclesiastical Conventions, and those of charitable collections."

If you would just add to that order, "and for Lenten services the House of Bishops may prescribe a Lectionary," whatever is desired can be secured by amending that clause "of the order of the services of the Church," without confining ourselves, as my friend from Alabama objects, to any form of Lectionary constitutional in its character. If the House is willing to entrust the construction of this Lectionary to the House of Bishops, it can be done by a simple addition to that clause. This, of course, would have to go down to the dioceses as an amendment to that order. It takes the same course precisely by simply an addition to the order for reading the Psalter and reading the Scriptures, that the House of Bishops may prescribe a Lectionary for Lenten services, and other days such as Rogation and Ember days, if it be desired.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. May I suggest to the Deputy from Virginia, that there is this difficulty about the Lectionary : When our Lectionary was established it was a different Lectionary from that of the Church of England, and now the Church of England has, within the past three years, put forth a new Lectionary. Now, if this is passed, we shall only have the opportunity of putting out such Lessons for Lent and other fast days, but no opportunity of amending the whole Lectionary, which is very much needed, though perhaps not quite as much as the other ; whereas, if Dr. Fulton's amendment to the Constitution passes, any General Convention can take up the subject of the

Lectionary, and with all the safeguards that are thrown around concurrent action, put forth a new Lectionary, both for Sundays and week-days.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Alabama read this proposition again ?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. It is to add to Article VIII. of the Constitution these words :

"Provided, however, that the Lectionary may be changed at any time by concurrent action of both Houses of General Convention."

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Does that cover the use of the Psalter ?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. No, sir ; that would have to be put in if you want to make a change there.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I object to Dr. Fulton's amendment, in terms as introducing one of the most extraordinary Rubrics that can be, "Provided that the Lectionary may be changed at any time." I do not want that temptation to lie upon the pages of the Prayer-Book, to the absolute uncertainty and restlessness and readiness to move that there is in this people at this time.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. He does not propose it as an amendment to the Prayer-Book, but as an amendment to the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. He proposes, I understand, that the Lectionary may be changed at any time.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Not in the Prayer-Book. It is an amendment in the Constitution.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Well, it is a constitutional Prayer-Book ; and the putting in of such a principle as that, by which it may be changed at any time, is not a good principle to me, and I believe on consideration it will be so regarded all over the House. I myself have read the service of the Church daily for nearly thirty years, and I must honestly say that the Lent Lessons are to me a very strange thing. They vary daily and are entirely unsuited to the daily service in Lent, and some of them to any time, and I do wish that we had a Lent Lectionary for our purpose ; and yet there are so many gentlemen here whom I respect who have expressed a different opinion, and there is such a possibility of various arguments, that I do not submit anything to this Convention, but I think the matter ought to be deliberated upon more than it can be now at the end of this session. I think the best plan at last would be to submit the consideration of this whole matter to a commission of Bishops and members of this House, who should take it into their full thought and examine the various things that have been proposed before us, and give us their mature and deliberate judgment.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. May I ask whether this would give us immediate relief ? If it did, I should vote for it. I think it is a step in the right direction. Undoubtedly, I should be very glad if some measure could be taken by which this relief would be immediately granted. I will willingly and gladly vote for the proposition if I can.

The PRESIDENT. The only provisional relief you can receive is from your own Diocesan.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It seems to me that it is entirely too late in the session to propose a new substantial change in the Constitution of the Church. It is conceded on all sides that we can have no relief for three years. The proposition of the Deputy from New York, provides what we all believe will be substantial relief at the end of three years ; that is, a Lectionary which has been carefully revised, and is now presented to us, which will remain before the Church for three years, and may be then adopted as a whole without any Constitutional change whatever.

Now, the proposition of the Deputy from Alabama will go to add still further to the unsettled feeling which prevails in the Church, arising from the many changes which we have proposed in the Constitution. What was adopted on Saturday will be a very thorough change, if it shall be finally agreed to, three years hence. I think now we ought to stand upon what we have done, without further movements in that direction. I hope, therefore, the proposition of the Deputy from New York will be adopted, which is certainly a movement in the right direction, and will give us three years hence a Lectionary far preferable to what we have; and if then we think proper to go further in the same direction, we shall be able to do so. This Church moves, and ought to move slowly, even in a good direction. I hope, therefore, that the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama will not be pressed, but that we may come to a vote upon that of the Deputy from New York.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I hope the proposed amendment will be adopted. I do not see the least danger in it. It is agreed that the subject of the Lectionary needs attention. I do not believe that when the provision of the Constitution was inserted protecting the Book of Common Prayer from the changes except by a notice of three years, attention was drawn to the subject of the Lessons. It seems to me that it is excessive conservatism to say that you cannot trust the entire House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with the selection of proper portions of Scripture to be read in the Church, and with prescribing the rule therefore. We are not changing any Scripture. We are always reading the Scriptures.

The present portion of the Lectionary now before us for consideration is taken by a mere arbitrary rule without regard to the subject-matter. The gentleman from Alabama proposes to give the control of this particular subject of the selection of Scripture lessons for all times to the General Convention. It will take three years by any process. If we adopt the proposition before us as originally reported, we shall have accomplished that result in three years, but we shall be six years off now from any other possible result in the matter of the Lectionary.

There is no doubt that this proposed Lectionary for Lent will be adopted by the next Convention under its constitutional power, and therefore it will go into force just as quick as if we adopt it as a proposed amendment to the Prayer-Book. I think every one here is prepared to-day to vote that the power of the selection of Lessons, and prescribing a rule for it, should always rest in the General Convention, and need not necessarily be delayed three years when a change is proposed, for we are not drawing on our own discretion or our own wisdom for the Lessons; we are always drawing on the inspired Word of God. When that is the case, it is a sufficient check upon any Convention or upon any Church, so that they cannot go far wrong.

I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama will be adopted, for it will secure the object intended by the Message of the House of Bishops, and also this further control, so that if we find any slight change needed in that Lectionary we can make it. But if we adopt the Message of the House of Bishops, and that Lectionary should be found faulty in any particular however slight, we should have to wait three years before we could change it. The idea that because we are at the end of the session we should fail to do anything that changes an existing rule, is too excessive cautiousness. Let us give the control to all the Bishops and this House of the Lectionary, and of providing the rule for the fu-

ture on that subject. I do not think the Church will ever be endangered by the exercise of it.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I am very sorry that I cannot agree with the gentleman who has just spoken, in saying that the whole House are ready to consent to the charge of Lectionary, or put it in the hands of the House of Bishops or the General Convention, to change it at any time; but I should like to remind the member of this House that coupling the action which is now proposed with the action taken on Saturday in regard to a shortened form of service, they are in danger of legislating in a manner which means simply to take away all the bars that hinder our tampering with the Prayer-Book and make changes in the Prayer-Book easy. That seems to be the motive of this legislation, simply how shall we get at the Prayer-Book? How can we take off the hindrance that the wise conservatism of the Church has put in our way, so that we must scrupulously study every change, and put it in the power of a single Convention, which may be moved by questions and motives that come up at the time and that another three years would sweep entirely out of the way—how can we put it in the power of a single Convention to make all these changes? And in this connection, let me also remind members of the singular meaning of their action on Saturday which is coupled with this. One of the safeguards taken at the time of the English Reformation was to sweep away the diversity of use which had been complained of as an evil and a wrong in the Church of England, the use of Sarum, the use of Hereford, the use of Bangor, each having its separate use, and to bring the Church of England to a uniformity in service. But under the plea of making changes in the Prayer-Book easy, this House has actually voted and granted as far as it is in its power at present to return to that old principle of each Diocese having its separate use, and the plea of privileged usage in opposition to the usage of the Reformation was urged from a quarter from which, from its Protestant character, I hardly expected to see it. I certainly thought the reverend gentleman who urged it so eloquently was one who would have stood by the principles of the English Reformation in opposition to what some have called the more antiquated principles of the early Church, but he abandoned the ground of the English Reformation and went back to primitive ages, in stating that it was the primitive custom for each Diocese to have its separate use, and, therefore, we ought not to be afraid of it. But the English Church deliberately abandoned that principle of separate use and came back to uniformity.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. If the gentleman refers to anything I said, it only shows how little he knows of my Church sentiments.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I give that only as an illustration; but I say most earnestly that the Lectionary of this Church is not a piecemeal system, but an entire system; and that to tamper with it rashly—to make changes in it easily—to make changes in it without full and careful consideration, will throw us open to the danger of having a piece of patchwork as the Lectionary for the whole year, if we enter on it thus piece by piece. I think it is a subject that ought to be remitted to the careful consideration and the lengthened consideration of a commission, instead of being pushed through at the close of the session, with the House half full, on the ground that there is no time to consider it fairly, and that we must get relief somehow by fair means or foul.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I am in favor of the proposed Lectionary for Lent. I should also favor, very much, the revival of the present

Calendar, so as to give us an acceptable Lectionary for the whole year; but it does seem to me that it is too late now for us to enter into the consideration of proposed amendments to the Constitution. I call attention to the fact that in one amendment proposed several days ago to Article 3, concurrence was refused by the House of Bishops on the very ground that it was then too late for them to consider the matter. On Saturday we sent up an addition to the eighth article of the Constitution, which, I presume, is now before the House of Bishops. And now we have another proviso to the same article. If that amendment is adopted by the House of Bishops, the wording of this proviso must be altered. We have one "proviso" already, and so the wording, as proposed, must be changed to "provided further." We are just in this condition of things; we do not know where we are, owing to the fact that the House of Bishops have not reported on the proposed amendment which we agreed to on Saturday.

I am in favor of the proposed Lectionary, as I said, but I am utterly opposed to our going into the consideration of new amendments to the Constitution at this late hour of the session; and without any desire to obstruct the progress of these proposed amendments if it be the will of the House to go on with them, I raise the question whether this is not new business which cannot be entered upon without the consent of two-thirds?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir, it is not new business. It is proposed as an amendment to matter sent down to us by the House of Bishops, simply stating the judgment of this House, that the object proposed to be effected by the House of Bishops in one way can be most properly effected in another way.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I submit to the ruling of the Chair, but I think it is new business.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I wish to say, Mr. President, that it seems to me very extraordinary for gentlemen to get up here and talk about new business and about the lateness of the session, when everybody knows that this matter of shortened services and this matter of the Lectionary were introduced in the early part of the session, and have only been put over because they had to be put over; and now, after having put this over to the last day of the session, to come in and say "it is too late," is simply to prevent a thing which the mind of this Church has been set upon, and which has been under consideration, too, since 1868.

I wish to say further, in reply to the reverend gentleman from Central Pennsylvania, that this is no movement for the alteration of the text of the Prayer-Book. It is simply a movement to allow us to use other portions of Scripture than those we have been using. There surely can be no danger in using a chapter out of St. James instead of another chapter out of the same Epistle. There can be no danger in using a chapter out of the Prophets instead of a chapter out of the historical books. It does not interfere, it cannot interfere, with anything that relates to the Prayer-Book. It is simply a matter of devotion and propriety.

Then in the next place let it be considered that we are not interfering with a system. The system of the Church of England of its lessons was altered at the time the American Prayer-Book was revised, and nobody can have read for instance Keble's *Christian Year*, without at once feeling and knowing that our lessons have been different from the lessons of the Church of England as they were at the last revision of the English Church, and now the English Church has revised its Lectionary again, and has put forth what I believe is a very admirable Lectionary. This is merely to give the House the

opportunity of setting forth a proper Lectionary at proper times.

I also want to say that I am surprised that the learned Deputy from Central Pennsylvania should have so far misunderstood the action of this House on Saturday. We never passed any resolution or any amendment to the Constitution permitting Dioceses to put forth different uses. All we did was to permit the General Convention, at some future time, if it wanted to do so, to allow the Dioceses to do such a thing, which is a very different proposition. It is a great way further off from that theory of different uses than what he stated. The next General Convention, if such a proposition is made by the Committee, may vote it down, and very likely would. We passed no such resolution in our amendment to the Constitution. I trust that this amendment which the Deputy from Alabama has brought forward may pass, for it simply gives the House of Bishops and this House the right to put forth a Lectionary; and do we not all know that if the two Houses should decide or think it proper to take the matter up, it would be considered most carefully; a commission would be appointed; it would at least take three years before we could get a right Lectionary? It is simply putting the matter forward just one little bit. I do not believe, even if this is passed, we shall get that new Lectionary before six years, or perhaps nine. What this is doing is simply to give us a chance to have a better Lectionary.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I almost regret, Mr. President, having introduced this amendment, because it has given rise to discussion at a very late hour of this session of the Convention. I do think that this matter is an important one, though not half so important as my reverend friend from Central Pennsylvania seems to have thought it. I should be unwilling that any motion of mine should occupy the attention of the Convention to-day; and, therefore, as, I think, the House has probably made up its mind, and perhaps may agree with myself that these matters had, after all, better go to a commission for the revision of the Rubrics—I do not know whether that is best or not [No, no]—but, at all events, it has been presented to my mind. I am simply going to move now to lay my own proposition on the table, with the purpose of voting against that.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Move that the vote be taken.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Very well. I move that the House vote immediately on my proposition, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. In order that ample guards may be thrown around the exercise of the power proposed by the gentleman from Alabama, I would suggest an addition to his amendment in these words:

"That it shall require a majority of all the members entitled to seats in each House, and of each order in the House of Deputies, to adopt such changes in the Lectionary."

So that the question will be presented to us whether in the future we are willing to trust a majority of all the Bishops, and a majority of all the Clerical Deputies, and a majority of all the Lay Deputies entitled to sit in the General Convention, to put forth an amended or changed Lectionary for the Church—not to do anything in the way of faith or practice except, in the language of the gentleman from Wisconsin, to improve the devotional exercises of the people by proper selections from the Holy Scriptures. For one, I am amazed at the want of trustfulness on the part of this House in themselves and in their successors. I do not believe that this Church is to go on in all time to come clothed in the armor of the

mediaeval ages of the past, and fettered by restraints which prevent it from availing itself of the opportunities to promote the cause of religion and advance the glory of God alongside of the other Christian churches of this land. I want our Church to have the chance, the opportunity in a constitutional, legal way, to adapt itself to the new developments of the time, to make it itself, as it ought be, the great missionary and evangelical power on this Continent. In that aspect of the case, whilst I am charged to be a stickler in favor of constitutional provisions, whilst I am in favor of adhering to all the sanctions of the Constitution, I still say that for one I am willing to trust the conservative sentiment, the Christian sentiment, the sentiment in favor of law and order of a majority of all the members elected to this Convention, in all the branches which are represented here; and with that addition to the proposition of my friend from Alabama, I do think fair, safe, and judicious means will be provided for the benefit of our Church in its further operations in the world.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I ask gentlemen how it would work. If we vote by Dioceses, certainly it will be a vote, even if there be not a majority of individuals making up the vote; and will it not conflict with that if we undertake to make a majority of individuals necessary?

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. A majority of all the Dioceses, I mean.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I thank my friend from Virginia for putting forward what appears to me to be so reasonable an amendment to my proposition. I accept it with all gratitude, and I think it makes what I have proposed entirely safe.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I want to say but a few words, but first I desire the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama to be read, including the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. If Virginia joins the movement party, I shall have great hope for our Church. The tendency of stillness is always to keep still, and, therefore, we have this great power of obstructiveness to overcome. One of the most refreshing symptoms I have observed in our House is the speech the gentleman from Virginia has just made.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I will read the proposition as it stands, the amendment proposed by myself being accepted by the learned Clerical Deputy from Alabama:

"Provided, That the Lectionary may be changed at any time by concurrent action of both Houses of the General Convention; but it shall require a majority of all the Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and of all the Dioceses entitled to be represented in the House of Deputies, to adopt such changes in the Lectionary."

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Mr. President, I understand very well the impatience of this House, and that that impatience is well founded. We are almost in the afternoon of the last day of this Convention, and though all agree, as I understand, that some relief in this matter is necessary, allow me to suggest that we are treading upon dangerous ground. Let me ask you what any member of this Convention would say if a proposition were introduced at this hour to enact a new Canon, fundamental in its features, and undertake to adopt it as a law, without having it go through the hands of the Committee on Canons, or any other Committee.

Although I may, with entire respect, I think, express the opinion that I do not agree with the Chair, but I do not appeal, yet without stopping to

doubt the proposition that this is not new business, we are seeking here, in half an hour, without the consideration of a committee, without deliberate action, with but few members of the Convention present, to adopt an amendment to the Constitution that strikes, in my humble judgment, deeper in the direction of the Prayer-Book than any proposition that has been before us during this Convention.

The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution reported the other day, and this Convention on Saturday approved it, I believe, to amend the Constitution in one respect, that by indirection touched the Prayer-Book; and what was it? It was that this Convention by Canon might take action for shortened services. But how? By express provision in that amendment limiting that power to a compilation from the Morning and Evening Prayers. The Committee on Amendments to the Constitution were somewhat doubtful, at least we discussed for some time the propriety of reaching the question of shortened services by an amendment of the Constitution, because it touched by indirection, as some thought, the Prayer-Book. But that objection was obviated in the minds of many, perhaps all of us, and so of the convention as it would seem by the vote taken, by the fact that we added to and made a part of the amendment the limitation that such shortened services should be compiled exclusively from the Prayer-Book.

Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, sprung upon this Convention, and asked to be passed upon affirmatively, without being reviewed by any Committee, without going to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, is to amend the Constitution, so that the General Convention hereafter by Canon or by resolution—I do not remember which, and I do not care—may reform and remodel the Lectionary. Is it one reform, one remodelling? No. I say to you as a lawyer, that unless I am very much mistaken, the construction of the gentleman's proposition will enable the General Convention by Canon or resolution to remodel that Lectionary at every single Convention for a hundred years to come. There is no limitation to remodelling. It may remodel three years hence; it may do it six years hence; it may do it nine years hence. I submit to you, gentlemen, that you are introducing into our fundamental law an element of danger, an element full of mischief. It is not at all like the amendment passed upon the other day. You do not remodel the Lectionary once, and make it stand there for aye. You do not impose any limit to this proposition to amend the Constitution. I submit to you that there is danger in this kind of legislation at this hour, without the intervention of any committee, without any thoughtful consideration, impressed simply and alone by the feeling that pervades your heart and the heart of everybody, that relief in some respects is wanted. Stimulated, I say, by this universal feeling, there is, in my humble judgment, great danger that you will do an act that by and by you and I and this Church will regret.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I do not rise to make a speech, but simply to move that we take the vote on this question in five minutes.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the vote on this proposition be taken in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. De ROSSET, of North Carolina. The Diocese of North Carolina will call for a vote by orders on this proposition.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. The object of this amendment, as I understand it, is to enable us to get a Lectionary. We now wish to get a Lectionary for Lent. We all agree that that is desirable. One has been prepared by a Committee

which was appointed six years ago. I believe it has been very carefully prepared, and will be accepted by the Clergy of this Church, almost, if not quite, unanimously. But, sir, this amendment must go down to the Dioceses, and come back the next General Convention, and then if it fails to pass, we are no nearer a new Lectionary than we are to-day. By my proposition we can reach the new Lectionary in three years, and no gentleman is able to point out any way by which we can reach it earlier than that. That is the earliest period at which it is possible for us to reach it. We can, if my substitute passes, reach it in three years. If the amendment to the Constitution which is proposed here passes, it is very uncertain, indeed, whether we can reach it in three years. In fact, I do not believe that the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama will pass the other House, and we are thrown back to the necessity of waiting six full years before we can possibly get a new Lectionary for Lent. I, for my part, should like to have one to read at our coming Lenten season. I wish we could do this immediately, but we cannot, and I have adopted the only way in which I think it can be done, and the only way in which it can be done soon—that is, in three years.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. Please state your proposition, sir.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Will the Secretary read my substitute?

Mr. KING, of Long Island. By adopting the substitute of the gentleman from New York we shall avoid loose legislation. We ought not to be called upon to amend our Constitution in the loose manner proposed here.

The Secretary read the substitute proposed by Rev. Dr. Beach, as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring,) That the Lectionary for week days in Lent, reported by the Joint Committee on that subject, together with that for the Rogation and Ember Days, presented by the same Committee, is hereby proposed as an addition in the Prayer-Book, and that it be made known by the Secretary of this body to the Convention of every Diocese of this Church, in accordance with the provision of Article VIII. of the Constitution, as matter for final action at the next General Convention."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I move to amend as follows:

"Resolved, That the Rubric appointing the order in which the Psalter is appointed to be read, be amended by adding to the fourth paragraph the following words: 'Or such selections as may have been appointed or permitted by the General Convention.'"

The result will be to bring the Lectionary under this provision, and put the direction of the appointment of the Lessons just where it should be by Rubric, and not by Canon, and make it just as constitutional as any other legislation before the House.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I rise to a point of order, whether there are not already two amendments or substitutes before the House?

The PRESIDENT. Two amendments are before the House.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I rise to a point of order. You cannot offer an amendment to a substitute. The substitute must be acted on.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama, inasmuch as the two propositions are not inconsistent with each other, that if we adopt his proposition for a proposed constitutional amendment in place of the resolution of the gentleman from

New York, and that should go to the House of Bishops and be rejected, as it probably would be, then we should have nothing at all. I think, therefore, that we had better take the vote on the proposition of the gentleman from New York first. That will give some relief in case it be passed, as it probably will be. Then we can take a separate vote on the constitutional amendment, because the two may run *pari passu*, and may be each adopted if the House thinks proper.

The PRESIDENT. The first question, though, is on the amendment proposed by Dr. Fulton.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I ask Dr. Fulton to withdraw his proposition for the present, and let us vote on the proposition of the gentleman from New York, which is independent of his, not at all inconsistent with it, and if we adopt his, then come to a vote on that of the gentleman from Alabama, which presents an entirely different proposition, being a constituent amendment.

Rev. Mr. MARKS, of Mississippi. I move to lay the amendment of Dr. Fulton on the table.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If that motion is insisted on, I shall call for a vote by orders.

Rev. Mr. MARKS, of Mississippi. I submit that to reach Mr. Burgwin's point it is necessary to vote in this way. If we accept the substitute, we lose the opportunity of voting on the proposition of the Reverend Deputy from New York.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. In that view of the case, I withdraw my amendment until that of Dr. Beach is voted on. ["All right."]

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise to a point of order. Let it be withdrawn now, with the understanding by the whole House that it shall be voted on afterward, and that no question of order shall be raised.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he make his amendment an addition to the other. Then if it is adopted, it will be reached; but if it is voted down we shall stand alone on the other.

Rev. Mr. MARKS, of Mississippi. I rise to a question of order. Is the amendment withdrawn?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I shall present my motion after Dr. Beach's is voted upon.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the proposition of the gentleman from New York.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. I am told that if I withdraw this, I cannot bring it up again. If that is so, I move to lay mine on the table, that I may bring it up again.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I submit that the two are inharmonious.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on the resolution offered by the Deputy from New York (Rev. Dr. Beach).

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move the adoption as an original resolution of the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama [Rev. Dr. Fulton].

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I call for a vote by Dioceses and orders.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I now offer my proposition.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. This business of altering the Constitution when brought in as an amendment to a resolution might be brought in as not new business; but when the resolution to which it was first offered is passed, it now becomes new business, and, therefore, is out of order, and cannot be voted on.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order; it is that I have a right to offer an additional amendment.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, but inasmuch as we voted on the proposition of the gentleman from New York, putting aside this, under the view I took, I think a point of order ought not to be raised; but we ought to come to a vote upon it. I hope, therefore, the gentleman from Long Island will withdraw his objection and let us take the vote.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I hope Dr. Fulton's proposition will be read by the Secretary, so that we may know what we are to vote on.

The PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved, That Article VIII. of the Constitution be amended by adding the following:

"Provided, That the Lectionary may be changed at any time by concurrent action of both Houses of the General Convention, but it shall require a majority of all the Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops and of all the Dioceses entitled to be represented in the House of Deputies to adopt such changes in the Lectionary."

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I call for a vote by Dioceses and orders.

The PRESIDENT. That call can be made after this matter is perfected.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Very well.

The question being put, there were on a division, ayes 49, noes 71.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment is rejected.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I think the only proper motion is to non-concur with the House of Bishops. They propose one thing and we propose a different thing. That is constitutional.

The question was put on the resolutions of the House of Bishops as amended, and they were concurred in.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Does not that require a constitutional vote? If we send back this proposition to the House of Bishops we are done with it.

Rev. DR. DALZELL, of Louisiana. No, we act on it three years hence.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. So far as this session is concerned, we are done with it, and it stands precisely as if it had been an independent, new proposition for the alteration of the Prayer Book. Now I call for the vote by Dioceses and Orders.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburg. I understand from the Secretary that it has not been the practice of the House to vote by Orders on such a proposition when it is introduced for the first time; but on the question of the final agreement to it in the next General Convention the vote must be taken that way.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Let us proceed with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the vote need not necessarily be by Dioceses and Orders. The action of the House of Bishops is concurred in with the amendment moved by Rev. Dr. Beach.

RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

A message (No. 82) was received from the House of Bishops announcing that that House had adopted, and asked the concurrence of the House of Deputies in, the resolutions accompanying the report of the Joint Committee on Communication with the Russo-Greek Church, viz.:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That this General Convention has great satisfaction in learning the courteous and brotherly tenor of the letters received from the Most Reverend Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople; Sophronius, Patriarch of Alexandria; Hierothius, Patriarch of Antioch; Isidore, President of the Holy Governing Synod of Russia, and Theophilus, Metropolitan of Athens,

President of the Holy Synod of Greece, in answer to the communication of the action of the last General Convention, through the Joint Committee, as now reported.

"Resolved, That we regard the establishment of full and free reciprocal relations of Christian brotherhood between the great Eastern Churches and our own Communion as daily growing in importance and in hopefulness, and heartily pray the Great Head of the Church that His Spirit may so rule in all our Councils as to remove all hindrances which the pride, prejudice, or error of human frailty may present to hinder its consummation.

"Resolved, That we desire the continuance and increased frequency of friendly correspondence with our brethren of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, in the assured confidence that on either part there will be the fullest recognition of all feelings and rights which might be imperilled by undue or inconsiderate interference.

"Resolved, That the Rev. Charles R. Hale, Secretary of the Russo-Greek Committee, has merited the cordial thanks of the Church for his efficient labors, and for his liberal devotion of his private means to the furtherance of the works of the Committee.

"Resolved, That as the work to be done in the future in the cause of intercommunion will consist in great part in correspondence and conferences with the hierarchy of the various branches of the Eastern Church, which can be more fitly done by the Bishops of the Church, as occasion may arise, your Joint Commission ask to be discharged from further consideration of this matter."

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, as the senior clerical member of what has been known as the Russo-Greek Committee, I beg to move that we concur with the resolutions which have just been sent down to us from the House of Bishops. I think they require no separate discussion; but there are two matters which I should like the Convention to think about. One is the very great debt of gratitude that not only the Committee but our whole Church, and not only our whole Church, but really the Churches of God throughout the world, owe to the Secretary of that Committee, the Rev. Charles R. Hale; and I trust that the resolution in his favor will be adopted with a true sentiment of gratitude toward him. The work he has done has been simply prodigious, and I certainly feel that we are under very many obligations to him.

The only reason why our Committee has not been disbanded has been on account of the labor he has done. The other members of the Committee have been really able to do comparatively little or even nothing at all. The reason for our disbanding has been because we felt that in delicate matters of intercommunion it would be better for the Bishops to have that whole subject wholly in their hands. I move, sir, that we concur in the resolutions which have been sent down.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I second the motion.

The resolutions were agreed to unanimously.

GERMAN PRAYER-BOOK.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. I ask consent to introduce the report of the Joint Committee on the Translation of the Book of Common Prayer in German. It has never been my habit to do anything out of time, out of place, or out of order, but this report has been delayed by circumstances very much. It will require no discussion, and is brief, but contains a matter that I think the members of the Convention ought to know. Therefore, I ask the Secretary to read it.

The Secretary read the report as follows:

PRAYER-BOOK IN GERMAN LANGUAGE.

"The Joint Committee on the Translation of the Prayer-Book into the German Language respectfully report, that during the past three years the work has been carefully and successfully prosecuted. The whole Prayer-Book and the appended officers, with the exception of the Institution Office, have been rendered into the German language, and a considerable portion of this translation has been printed in order to subject it to criticism and to the practical test of actual use in public services. By the liberality of a member of Grace Church, New York, we have printed the offices for Morning and Evening Prayer, the Communion Office, etc., as a book for Missionary service, and it has been tried in several places by the authority of the Ordinary. It is on sale, and can be obtained at a very moderate price. Other offices have been printed in the *Kirchenblatt*, and in that form have been revised by competent critics.

"The scholar to whom this very important and delicate task has been committed, the Rev. G. F. Siegmund, is a native of Germany, educated in her Universities, and remarkably qualified by nature and by previous studies, and as well, we trust, by Divine Grace, for the work. He is a Deacon of the Diocese of Western New York, a man of mature age, having been a Lutheran pastor for many years before his admission to our communion. The general rules under which he has labored with great enthusiasm, and wholly without any other reward than his interest in the Church and his love of his Master, are as follows :

"1. Whatever in our Anglican Prayer-Book is borrowed from the ancient liturgies should be translated directly from the Greek and Latin, and not from the English.

"2. Whatever can be found in the Old German Agendas translated from the ancient liturgies in the liturgical language of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should be appropriated.

"3. Not only in the lessons and psalms, and in the literal quotations from the Bible, but even in allusions to Scriptural expressions, the German Prayer-Book is to follow the text of Luther's German Bible, which is the only German translation of authority made from the Hebrew and Greek.

"4. In translating the distinctly Anglican portions of the Prayer-Book, or such parts of ancient liturgies as are not to be found in old German translations, the words and idioms should be taken from the vocabulary of the German Bible and the Old German liturgies.

"5. To secure the highest degree of verbal and idiomatic accuracy, the work of the translator should be submitted to living critics of high position in Germany, and their suggestions should be very carefully considered and respected.

"It gives us pleasure to say that such German critics as Schoeberlein, Reusch, Haupt, and others have been consulted. They have taken a generous interest in the measure, and have borne the most gratifying testimony to the beauty and liturgic spirit of the translation. They have taken pains to indicate a few desirable alterations, and their advice has been followed to a considerable extent. As they did not sufficiently allow for the very strict fidelity to the originals required by our Liturgic Constitutions, we could not always accept their improvements.

"We regret that our venerable Chairman had not been able to meet with us, but we rely on him for valuable aid in our ultimate action and report. The work, then, is not complete, but it is in a high de-

gree of forward progress, and your Committee respectfully beg to be continued.

"W. H. ODENHEIMER,
Bishop of New Jersey.
A. CLEVELAND COXE,
Bishop of Western New York.
W. D. WILSON,
GEORGE LEEDS,
HENRY DRISLER."

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. Mr. President, at this late period of the Convention, I certainly will not take up time by saying many words in regard to this translation. We have at last found, as we believe, the man who is capable of making a translation that the German population of our country will accept and that will be successful and useful. We have hopes and assurances from the gentlemen in Germany whose names are mentioned in the report, that this translation will be approved by the best writers there, and will be welcomed by them as a most valuable contribution in their work of reform in what is called the Old Catholic movement, and also in gathering around this nucleus those members of the various Protestant Churches who are the most earnest and the most evangelical. I have examined a large share of the work that is submitted to us, and can assure you that we have now a man who is making a version of the Prayer-Book in German, which bears very much the same relation to the modern German of philosophy and current literature, that the language of our Prayer-Book and of our Bible bears to the popular literature of the day. We thus obviate the great difficulty that has always hitherto stood in our way in regard to former translations that have been made, that they were made by men of literature rather than liturgical learning. This difficulty also we are assured and believe is entirely removed.

I move that the report be transmitted to the House of Bishops to be presented there, and that the Committee be continued in order to complete their work.

The motion was agreed to.

DELEGATION TO CANADIAN SYNOD.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is the resolution reported by the Committee on the State of the Church nominating Rev. Dr. Craik, of Kentucky, Rev. Dr. Van Deusen, of Central New York, Rev. Dr. Schenck, of Long Island, and Governor Fish, of New York, Governor Stevenson, of Kentucky, and Judge Otis, of Illinois, as members on the part of this House of the Joint Delegation to the next Provincial Synod of Canada.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that that be approved and concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF JOURNAL.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is:

"Resolved, That there be appointed a Committee of Publication, composed of a member of the House of Bishops, and of one clerical and one lay member of the House of Deputies, together with the Secretaries of both Houses, who shall take order as to the publication of the two Journals, and adopt some means by which the expense and size of the Journal may be materially reduced.

"Resolved, That any scheme which may be adopted by this Committee shall include the furnishing a copy of the Constitution and Canons of this Church to every clergyman and candidate for orders in the same."

The resolutions were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be amended by inserting the clause "the House of Bishops

concurring," as they require the concurrence of the other House.

POINTING OF THE PSALTER.

The SECRETARY. The next business is the following resolution, reported by the Committee on the Prayer-Book, touching the introduction of the colon in the Psalter :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Standing Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book be authorized and instructed to introduce into all future editions of said Standard Prayer-Book the colon or musical pause in each verse of the Psalter and Canticles, in accordance with the pointing of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. If that be adopted, I hope there will be a preamble of this sort, "That this Church does not want the poor and illiterate to join in the responses." It will have just that effect. I happen to represent a constituency of three thousand working people. My friend on the right (Rev. Dr. Beach) who officiates to just such a class, will agree with me that every such point will be a bar to the poor joining in the responses. I know there is great difficulty in having responses now, but it is mostly a clerical difficulty, because the clergy read so fast that the people cannot follow them. Put this in, and as sure as we live we shall have still greater difficulties, for we have little idea what trouble there is to those who are illiterate. I sincerely hope the resolution will not pass.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. The question was asked when this was brought up whether it was not a mistake of the printer in leaving out the musical note or colon. On page 189 of the Journal of 1871, it will be found that the Committee on the Prayer-Book, to whom was referred a resolution touching this matter, reported :

"Resolved, That inasmuch as any departure from the standard edition of Book of Common Prayer is now wholly unauthorized, no further legislation, in the judgment of the Committee, is required."

It appears that the framers of our Liturgy made the alteration from the English Prayer-Book understandingly. The English Prayer-Book has the title of "The Psalter, or Psalms of David, pointed as sung or said in the Churches." The revisers of our Prayer-Book corrected the punctuation throughout, in order that the Psalter should be properly read. In Bishop White's *Memoirs of the Church*, a distinction is made between the reading of Psalms and the singing of Psalms. The words stricken out, "or sung," seem to be a virtual prohibition of Psalms being sung except those in metre. I hope, sir, we shall not allow this resolution to pass. It will break up the reading of the psalms, as they should be read in many of their churches, and I entirely agree with the Deputy from Pennsylvania that we had better not touch that inestimable heritage which we have, our blessed Prayer-Book. If we begin to alter in this way, we may as well go on and make several other alterations. I have no objection to certain alterations, but I do protest against our breaking up a custom which has been made the custom from the time of the revision of our Liturgy down to this day; and if we once let in this entering wedge, brethren, you hardly know where we shall land. Let us hold fast to this Liturgy, and let us have our Prayer-Book as we have had it from the Revolution down.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I know of nothing more delightful, nothing more interesting than to hear the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey speak in this way concerning the Prayer-Book. It puts me a little in mind of something which I have read in Sir Walter Scott's novel of the "Fortunes of Nigel." The readers of that book will remember that

when the wickedness of Lord Dalgarno was found out, that the Duke of Buckingham and Prince Charles went to remonstrate with him on his wickedness; and King James, after hearing about it, came home, and said, "Oh, was it not delightful to hear baby Charles lecturing to Lord Dalgarno on the sin of dissimulation." [Laughter.] I wish to say that I entirely appreciate the admirable remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey; but let it be understood that the object of bringing in this colon is not to prevent people from reading the Psalter. I believe that where the Psalter cannot be sung properly, it had a great deal better be read. There is nothing to me more unpleasant than a poor, wretched attempt to sing the Psalter. But I do not suppose that this Convention is prepared to say in this day that the Psalter shall not be sung. It does not mean to go back on King David, who certainly knew as much about the Psalms as my reverend brother from New Jersey [laughter], and who is perpetually singing, "Oh, let us come and sing unto the Lord," "Oh, sing unto the Lord" this and that. I am sure we cannot go back on King David.

All that this colon provides for is that if the Psalter is sung it can be sung properly. For instance, I have no great power to sing. I go into a church where the Psalter is being sung, and I would like to join in. I find the colon, which tells me where the division is, and so, in a halting way, pretty poorly, but still I can join with them. The object of this is simply to help when the Psalter is sung that it may be sung better. It is not at all to make the singing of the Psalter universal. Not for the world would I make my reverend brother sing the Psalter if he does not want to. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I shall not try, for I cannot sing any better than he can. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. There is one thing that I am sure my reverend brother from New Jersey will believe in and will be thankful to hear; and that is that the colon is to be found in that proposed book which has become the basis of the Prayer-Book of the Reformed Episcopal Church. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. Mr. President, the discussion of this subject illustrates the importance of little things. This seems to be a small matter, and yet around it revolves the great question of the musical service of the Church. The objection has been raised by the clerical deputy from New Jersey, that it puts an obstruction to the reading of the Psalter.

Now it is a fact that in almost every verse of the Psalter in which we propose to place the colon, there is already a semicolon in the very place where we wish to have the colon. What is a semicolon? It is a colon with a caudal appendage added to it, which is a greater abstraction than the colon itself. What we desire is to cut off the appendage and lessen the obstruction.

We are told this is an alteration of the Prayer-Book. In the preface to our American Prayer-Book those who revised it say, "It will also appear that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require."

The revisers of our American Prayer-Book did not intend to deprive us of any privilege belonging to us as our heritage from the English Church; but the circumstances of the time of the revision made it seem expedient that this point should be left out, because they did not suppose that we should ever require musical services. The musical service, at that time, of the Church of England was very much behindhand; but within the last thirty years it has been greatly revived; and now, in every

church, cathedral, and chapel of the Church of England you hear the Psalms of David chanted every Sunday. There is no exception to this rule, I believe. I know, so far as my observation is concerned, that every small chapel which I entered, as well as the cathedrals, chant the Psalter of David, to the great edification of the common people and of all classes of the people.

I say, sir, it is an indictment against the fathers of our American Church to say that they intended to rob us of any privileges belonging to us as our inheritance from the days of the Reformation. This does not hinder the retaining of the old orthodox method. Any man may still have his quartet, his well-instructed choir in a high gallery at the rear of the church, trilling and warbling to the rafters and beams above them, while the congregation below stand or sit listlessly idle, and unemployed in the worship of God in the pews below. He may have that, if he chooses. I do not, if I can get something better.

But why shall those who wish to have that old method revived stand in the way and hinder us from having what we deem to be a better method, a more edifying method, a method more adapted to drawing out the spiritual element in the hearts of the people? This last method I have referred to was not the idea of the great Puritan poet—Puritan poet, I say to my friend from New Jersey—who said respecting the cathedral service:

“There let the pealing organ blow
To the full-voiced choir below,
In service high and anthems clear,
That may in sweetness through mine ear
Dissolve me into ecstasies,
And bring all heaven before mine eyes.”

That was the idea of the great Puritan poet, and it does not differ much from the effect produced upon a Puritan preacher not far from this place in attending the cathedral service of the Church of England. What does he say of the effect produced upon his mind and his devotional feelings in attending the glorious cathedral service? He could hardly find language to express the power of that cathedral service to raise and elevate his spiritual affection; but he tells us that it carried him upward almost to the confines of the celestial regions; reiterating the same impression which the great Puritan poet expressed in such beautiful language. And I believe, sir, that any one who goes into the cathedrals of the Church of England, or generally into the parish churches of the Church of England, and sees the revival of the devotional element produced—I am sure I may say literally produced by the introduction of the choral service by the restoration of the Psalter to its legitimate office in calling out devotional feelings and inspiring the sacred feelings of the heart and raising them up on the wings of language inspired for that very purpose—no one can go there in the midst of such congregations without being himself elevated and filled with the feeling that this is true worship.

It does assimilate us to the heavenly choir; for what is that but the musical expression of devotion before the Throne Eternal? It is prolonging the voice of that heavenly choir which introduced the Gospel at the Saviour's birth. It is enabling us to obey the precept of the Holy Apostle singing to himself, alternating antiphonally among ourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making offering of our hearts to the Lord. It is enabling us to fulfil the precept incorporated into every ancient Liturgy, *Sursum corda*.

I do not wish to dwell upon this subject. I believe the hearts of the convention are disposed to go

with me. But I have one word to say upon the pecuniary objection which I believe is to be brought up against this measure. Objection is raised as to the cost of it, that the Prayer-Book Society will be put to some expense in altering the Prayer-Book to conform to this resolution. As I have already said, it is merely cutting off in most cases the small appendage to the semicolon. That could not involve a very great expense. Sometimes the plates will have to be altered by an insertion of a colon. I have heard three thousand dollars mentioned; then again that has been raised to five thousand dollars. I supposed it might be raised still higher; but I have consulted with a practical printer, and he tells me that it will not nearly come up to the least of these sums; but whatever it may be, is that to be an obstacle in the way of such an object as this? I say that this light was lighted by the Great Illuminator for the benefit of the Church, and it cannot be put out by any such pecuniary extinguisher as is proposed to be put upon it.

I hope that the matter will be sent down to the various Conventions in our Church, to be acted upon at the next General Convention, and I propose a resolution to that effect.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I should like to ask this question: Owing to our punctuation varying, I believe, from the English Book, will it not require other changes in the punctuation of the psalms? If not, I am in favor of it.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. No, sir, it will not.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I sympathize entirely with the eloquent remarks which have been made; but I would be very glad to see exactly the connection of the question whether in the Prayer-Book, the standard edition, this colon was inserted by the compilers of our book. That Prayer-Book was made the standard after due consideration. Then again it was corrected, and in the Prayer-Book as made the standard and corrected the colon is not to be found, and has not been in the Prayer-Book of the American Church since that time. Therefore this would work necessarily a change of the Prayer-Book. It is the introduction into the Prayer-Book of something that is not there. The change, I think, is valuable, but I think it is very undesirable to have it done in any other way than the constitutional method. If it is now proposed as an amendment or change of the Prayer-Book, under the Article of the Constitution, to be acted upon by another Convention, very well; but I submit respectfully that this Convention has not within it the power to make the change in the Book, because the Article of the Constitution shuts them out from it.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. That is what I want to do.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I say that the Prayer-Book is to be determined by the first standard Prayer-Book of 1793, as that Prayer-Book was amended by the correction of certain *errata* therein found. I have here a copy of it. That is the standard Prayer-Book which decides what the Prayer-Book was as it left the hands of the compilers, and remained the standard Prayer-Book of this Church to the end of the century. Then the standard Book was the Book of the Prayer-Book Society in Pennsylvania. Now the Standard Prayer-Book is as you have it issued by the New York Bible and Common Prayer-Book Society, without the colon. I understand that the colon is a musical sign. I think it a good thing to have; but I submit that you cannot have it until you alter the Prayer-Book, and that is to be done in only one way.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Allow me to ask a question. Is it not proposed by the gentleman

who offered the resolution to have it sent to the Dioceses to have the Prayer-Book altered?

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. That is what the proposition is.

The SECRETARY. There is nothing of that sort in the resolution at the desk.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. I am going to offer a new resolution.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I suppose that if the gentleman intends that that resolution shall affect only the standard, it will be very harmless, for I am told by the publisher of the standard Prayer-Book that it will probably take some fifteen or twenty years to work off the first edition. If the cutting off of the tails of commas would make good singers in the Church, or if it would accomplish that which I think is more to be desired and more necessary—the making of good readers—I do not know but that I should go for it notwithstanding the expense, for I believe the gentleman had reference to me.

As I understand it, however, all the Prayer-Books are to be altered by the insertion of these colons hereafter, or after the expiration of three years, if this passes. Now, it is to be considered by the Convention, I think, that there are thousands upon thousands of Prayer-Books in the hands of publishers of the Prayer-Book and the various societies which are getting out that book, and it is a very serious thing to these gentlemen and these societies to have such a resolution as this put in here. Already, this Hymnal business has made them stand aghast; and fears have been entertained that fortunes would be lost by the action of this Convention. I think that the money question is a very serious one.

Sir, the whole of this improvement which the gentleman speaks of in our services is already provided for. Books have been prepared with the pointed Psalter. The Psalter itself is published separately with the musical points. Another thought occurs to me. By whose authority, under whose management, and skill, and knowledge are these pointings to be made?

As I understand it, there is great difference of opinion among musical people as to where these points should be; and that is a question which ought to be decided in some way or other. If we are to have these points, I do not think we must go to work and simply cut off the tails of the commas wherever they happen to be. I imagine that it will be found that these points will have to be put in in some different places from those which the Committee regard as the proper ones.

For all these reasons, I think we had better let the Prayer-Book alone in this regard, and leave the Churches to sing antiphonally, and use the Psalter in the Choirs according to the methods which have been already provided for them.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. It is to keep the Prayer-Book in our own hands that this resolution is proposed, and not to give it up to those who have no authority to publish it with the pointed Psalter. As to the place in which the colon is to be put, it is definitely determined by the resolution, that is the place where it has been in the English Prayer-Book since the days of the Reformation. That is good enough for us; that is all we want. It does not make so much difference where the point is, as that there is a point where we can come up.

Rev. Mr. McCULLOUGH, of South Carolina. I venture to say a word which I would not presume to say if it were not that since I have been in New York I have ascertained that copies of Bishop White's history of the early proceedings of the Church are not very common, and, therefore, the fact may not be known to all the members of the

House that Bishop White defends himself with his usual humility for his persistence in insisting upon selections of Psalms, and gives, as a reason for it, that he thought those Psalms selected and published in selection were better adapted to be sung, a method which he considered the only proper method of using the Psalms of David in public worship; and thence I infer that the omission of the musical point in the Psalter was rather accidental and from carelessness. I merely call the attention of the House to this fact that Bishop White was an advocate, and so he has recorded himself, of the musical rendering of the Psalms.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I should like to ask whether if the punctuation be so altered it will promote the intelligent reading of the Psalter, or whether it will interfere with it?

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. It will not interfere with it.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. It is simply the colon as it is found in the English Prayer-Book, and has been in the English Prayer-Book since the time of the Reformation.

The resolution was read as follows:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Standing Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book be authorized and instructed to introduce into all future editions of said standard Prayer-Book the colon or musical pause in each verse of the Psalter and Canticles, in accordance with the pointing of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England."

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. That resolution was reported favorably by the Committee on the Prayer-Book, with great unanimity, but the constitutional objection has been raised since, and I submit that the resolution which I offer now should be considered as an amendment to that, because it was supposed at the time the thing could be done immediately. But we find it cannot be done immediately, and therefore I propose the other method of sending it down to the Dioceses and acting upon it at the next General Convention. That is an amendment to the report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Resolved, That the resolution respecting the restoration of the colon or musical pause in the Psalter from the English Prayer-Book, as reported by the Committee on the Prayer-Book, be approved, so as to send the same down to the several Diocesan Conventions for their consideration, to be acted on at the next Convention."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The resolution, to read properly, should be:

"Resolved further, That the above proposition be submitted to the Dioceses as a proposed amendment to the Prayer-Book, according to the article of the Constitution in such case provided."

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that the matter be recommitted to the Committee on the Prayer-Book.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. There is no use of recommitting it. We are unanimous upon it, and I think it can be fixed in five minutes.

The PRESIDENT. The object of recommitment is merely to put it in form.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that we suspend this order until it can be put in form and go on with the next.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The Committee on the Prayer-Book reported a resolution that "the original resolution requires constitutional action." Then, if you desire that that shall stand as a propo-

sal to the Dioceses, all you have to do is to make it read thus :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following alteration of the Prayer-Book be proposed, to wit, that the Standing Committee," etc.

The PRESIDENT. That is right. Is the House ready for the question ?

Rev. Dr. GEER, of New York. I wish to ask if the Committee were unanimous in recommending that resolution ?

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. There was no objection to it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. The Committee were unanimous.

Mr. MASSIE, of Virginia. That is a mistake. The Committee were not unanimous.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. At the suggestion of the Clerical Deputy from Kansas [Mr. Bakewell], I will put in the Selection of Psalms.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I do respectfully protest against this kind of loose legislation on important matters. There is a regular way of coming at this matter, and it is certainly going to be put through in a careless way. Here we have the report of the Committee, and the Committee itself seem to have had constitutional difficulties. Now we are going to add the Canticles, the other part of the Psalms, and so on.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. It is already added.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There is a regular way, I think, of proposing these matters :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it be proposed to the several Dioceses that it is at the next Convention proposed to consider and determine upon the following resolution."

The PRESIDENT. I expect the resolution is substantially to that effect as it has now been amended. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows :

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following alteration in the Prayer-Book be proposed, to wit: That the Standing Committee on the Standard Prayer-Book be authorized and instructed to introduce into all future editions of said Standard Prayer-Book the colon or musical pause in each verse of the Psalter, Canticles, and Selection of Psalms, in accordance with the pointing of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That will not do. That gives power to a standing Committee to make changes. That is an alteration of the Prayer-Book.

The PRESIDENT. I suppose what you do by another you do by yourself.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I wish to say but a single word. I stand alone, representing the lay Delegation of my Diocese, and I am utterly opposed to the passage of the resolution at all. In another meeting I heard great credit given to the persons who have taken the dissemination of the Prayer-Book in hand. A large number at great expense have been disseminated, and great good has been accomplished. I am opposed to any alteration of the Book of Common Prayer. I am opposed to making the Psalter principally designed for singing instead of reading, and I am opposed to doing that which will destroy the value of tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of volumes already printed.

There are numerous objections to this in my mind. It seems to me that we are entering upon the question of altering the standard Book of Common Prayer, which has been sacredly preserved as the standard. Gentlemen here would not even commit the power to this Convention to make selections from Scripture, but they do not hesitate at all to alter the standard Book of Common Prayer. If

you alter it in a comma, you may alter the sense very materially.

Nobody knows, without a detailed examination, what would be the effect of putting a colon in the Psalter in reading. I know, in listening to the singing of anything, the division made is often such as utterly to destroy the sense ; and the demands of the musical art, with which I am not familiar, require that changes in the sense should be made, thus unfitting the matter for reading. But my general principle is that I am opposed to any alteration of the standard Book of Common Prayer as now preserved in the archives of this Church without the greatest object ; and the object of this is to make the Psalter to be sung instead of read. A Rubric in the beginning of the Prayer-Book says the Psalter shall be read. I do not deny the right of people to sing the Psalter if they think fit to do so. But we have Rubrics, which authorize many parts of the Prayer-Book to be either said or sung, a distinction which is maintained throughout, and you will here sanction the practice in the Church by the vote of this Convention that "said" and "sung" are indiscriminate terms, and whether the Rubric says "the following shall be said or sung" or merely says it "shall be said" makes no difference. Perhaps that has passed into a law already, but I am not in favor of voting for it in this way.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. In ninety-nine parishes out of a hundred, I venture to say, the Psalter is read and not sung.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I should like the colon, as it is in the English Prayer-Book, but I was opposed to this resolution in Committee, and did not vote for it. A majority of the Committee, however, were in favor of presenting it here, and I have said nothing against it, and did not intend to say anything against it ; but my brother from Long Island (Rev. Dr. Hall) has intimated that the constitutional question was not thought of by the Committee. It was thought of and considered.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I beg pardon ; I meant here on the floor of the Convention.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I should be willing to see the resolution adopted, but I do not think, at the present stage of the session, this House ought to go into such an important matter as this ; for it is an important matter. It will disturb the feelings of a great many persons in our Church, and it will be better to let it go over for the present. Three years ago this same resolution was introduced, and referred to the Committee on Prayer-Book, and that Committee reported against it. Precisely the same resolution was introduced this year, and a majority of the Committee were in favor of it.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. I beg pardon ; this resolution was not proposed at the last Convention.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. You will find a record of it in the Journal of the last Convention.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. Not this resolution, but another resolution.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. Substantially the same thing.

Rev. Dr. HUBBARD, of New Hampshire. That was a resolution to point the Psalter by the cadence, and all the musical points. This resolution only proposes one point, the colon.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. It is substantially the same thing. I have no objection to it personally, but I do not think that it would be well for the House to adopt it at present.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this action is not final. It is simply to propose this change

to the Dioceses, and then it comes up to us three years hence, when it may be thoroughly discussed. And in reply to the objection of the gentleman from Western New York, and the objection of others, I wish to read this Rubric:

"Then shall be said or sung one of the Selections, or some other portion of the Psalms, at the discretion of the minister."

The Church has always conceded the principle that the Psalter and the Selection of Psalms, or any Psalms, may be sung. I have read a Rubric in the Thanksgiving Office.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I object to any such argument as is presented by the gentleman from New Jersey, that the resolution will not be finally acted upon now, but go to the next Convention. This is a bad principle. If it does go down from this Convention to the next, it goes down with our consent and with our approbation; and I hold that the approbation of one General Convention goes very far towards making up the minds of the next. I am opposed to it; and I am opposed, further, to this resolution for several reasons, but one principal reason mentioned by the Deputy on my left (Mr. King), that out of the whole congregations in this land I suppose ninety-nine one-hundredths never sing the Psalter. There are some churches where it may be very well to sing the Psalter, where it is well done, but there are thousands of churches in the United States where the Psalter is not sung, and it will be many years to come before all our churches will be able to sing it. I am opposed to it, because it interferes with reading the Psalter. You take a comma and make a colon of it; you curtail it. That is the truth; it is curtailing the Prayer-Book, and I object to it. [Laughter.] You will make a colon where a comma is, and no one will read it properly, or if you put the colon where a semicolon is, you cannot read it properly.

I move that not only this substitute but the whole matter be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to; there being on a division ayes 74, noes 48.

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A message (No. 83) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it had appointed as member of the Joint Commission on the General Theological Seminary, called for in Message No. 68 from the House of Deputies, the Bishop of North Carolina and the Bishop of Pittsburgh.

COMMITTEE ON ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

A message (No. 84) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in Message No. 67 from the House of Deputies, appointing an additional member of the Joint Committee on Ecclesiastical Relation and Religious Reform, and that it had appointed as said additional member the Bishop of Central New York, in whose appointment it asked the concurrence of the House of Deputies.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I move that we concur.

The motion was agreed to.

STANDARD PRAYER-BOOK.

A message (No. 85) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in Message No. 70 from the House of Deputies, appointing the Rev. W. T. Webbe on Joint Committee on Stereotype Plate of Standard Prayer-Book.

FORCE OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

A message (No. 86) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it has appointed as members of the Joint Committee on the Force of Joint Resolutions (see Message 75 of House of Bish-

ops), on its part. The Bishop of Maryland, the Bishop of Rhode Island, the Bishop of Maine.

COMMISSION ON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A message (No. 87) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it had appointed on its part as members of the Joint Commission to consider and report as to legislation necessary to increased efficiency in the government of the General Theological Seminary, the Bishop of North Carolina and the Bishop of Pittsburgh.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

A message (No. 88) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it did not concur in message No. 83 from the House of Deputies as to the time of adjournment of the General Convention, and asked for a Committee of Conference, and informed the House of Deputies that it has appointed on such Committee on its own part, the Bishop of Western New York, the Bishop of Missouri, and the Assistant Bishop of Maryland.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is our Committee on Closing Exercises charged with that, or will it require another committee?

The PRESIDENT. I think that Committee had better be appointed on the subject of this message now.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that the message be concurred in, and that the Committee on Closing Exercises be appointed the Committee of Conference on the part of this House.

The motion was agreed to.

TRUSTEES OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A message (No. 89) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in Message No. 86 from the House of Deputies (confirming the persons nominated as Trustees of the General Theological Seminary).

PROOF-SHEETS OF STANDARD BIBLE.

A message (No. 90) from the House of Bishops announced that that House did not concur in Message No. 87 from the House of Deputies (continuing the Joint Committee to Examine Proof-Sheets of Proposed Standard Bible) for the reason that there is no duty of the kind now demanding attention.

CANON OF CHURCH MUSIC.

A message (No. 91) from the House of Bishops, announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the proposed Canon of Church Music, as amended by the House of Deputies, be adopted in the following form:

"1. The selections of the psalms in metre and hymns which are set forth by authority, and anthems in the words of Holy Scripture, are allowed to be sung in all congregations of this Church, before and after Morning and Evening Prayers, and also before and after sermons, at the discretion of the minister, whose duty it shall be, by standing directions, or from time to time, to appoint such authorized psalms, hymns, or anthems, as are to be sung.

"2. It shall be the duty of every minister of this Church with such assistance as he may see fit to employ from persons skilled in music, to give orders concerning the tunes to be sung at any time in his Church, and especially it shall be his duty to suppress all light and unseemly music, and all indecency and irreverence in the performance, by which vain and ungodly persons profane His service of the sanctuary."

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. In this connection I beg to present the report of the Committee of Conference on this subject, which pre-

sents the Canon in precisely the language that it has come from the House of Bishops. After the report was agreed on it was thought that something had been done last Saturday by this House that would interfere with the Canon in the way in which it was decided on; but the Committee of Conference after consideration think that their report need not be changed; that all the matters which were given to them as a Joint Committee of Conference are completely stated and fully treated upon in the report. But it appears to them that in order to reconcile this report with former proceedings of the House, and also in order to complete the Hymnal so that everything about it will be just as it should be, some resolution of this kind should be passed:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Canon on Church Music be printed in all authorized editions of the revised Hymnal, upon the fourth page of the same, in place of the matter now upon that page, and that this resolution take the place of the third, passed by the House of Bishops, as in Message No. 73 to this House, and concurred in by this House on the twenty-second day of its session."

That resolution was that the matter which is now upon the fourth page of the revised Hymnal be printed there, and have the authority of a Canon. Now a Canon has actually been adopted which, in some respects, varies from that matter which is there printed. Hence it is proposed that that Canon be printed in the place of the matter which we have already authorized to be printed there, and we repeal, in substance, the resolution which was passed on last Saturday. If, then, the House will take up the Canon, either as concurring with the House of Bishops or else as it is presented by the Committee of Conference and will pass it, this resolution following after that Canon will be sent to the House of Bishops, and when concurred in by them will complete this vexed matter.

I move, first, that we concur in the message from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. As I understand the message from the House of Bishops, it does not state, in accordance with the requirements of Canon 2 of Title 4, where this proposed Canon shall come in the Digest. It is expressly required by Canon 2 of Title 4 that it shall be named that the Canon is adopted as Canon so-and-so of Title so-and-so. That omission ought to be corrected before we pass it. Perhaps the Committee on Canons can straighten that out now. Where shall it come in the Digest?

The PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the message just read with regard to the music of the Church.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. I hope this proposition will pass. Some of us law and order men had doubt as to singing before; but if we have the authority of the Church, all will be well. Some one has said, "Let me make the songs of a nation, and I care not who may make its laws." I do rejoice that in matters of Ritual, so far as music is concerned, there has been so great an advance within the last few years. I do most heartily thank the Committee.

The message was concurred in.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Now I move this resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Canon on Church Music"—

And then mention the message in which it occurs

—"be printed in all authorized editions of the revised Hymnal, upon the fourth page of the same, in place of the matter now upon that page; and that this resolution take the place of the third passed by the

House of Bishops, as in Message No. 73 to this House, and concurred in by this House on the twenty-second day of this session."

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution just read.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE REVISED HYMNAL.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. A committee was appointed on Saturday, under a resolution offered by the Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island, in respect to the correction of typographical, clerical, and other mistakes in the revised Hymnal, and they have prepared and unanimously agreed to the report which I hold in my hand. I will state, before reading the report, that "I have myself, in connection with a member of the Committee and one of the Trustees charged with the duty of publishing the Hymnal, very carefully examined the subject, and we are satisfied that the emendations or corrections specified in this report are all that will be required, so that the two Houses will know that the Hymnal as revised and printed with these modifications will be the Hymnal to be used. I submit, therefore, the following report:

"The Special Committee to whom was referred the resolution offered by the Rev. Dr. Hall, in respect to certain typographical, clerical, and other mistakes found to exist in the revised Hymnal, and the correction thereof, in order that the editions to be published may, as far as practicable, be accurate, have carefully considered the subject, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Trustees authorized by a former joint resolution of the two Houses of the General Convention to superintend the revision and publication of the revised Hymnal, with power to make the typographical and other changes necessary to conform it to the report of the Committee on the Hymnal, be instructed in the discharge of their duties:

"1. To make all necessary corrections of clerical or typographical errors, or mistakes in punctuation in the text of the Hymnal, as revised and authorized by the General Convention at its present session:

"2. To substitute for the word 'Jesu' the word 'Jesus' wherever it occurs.

"3. To make the following corrections, in the printed slip, distributed to the Convention, and headed 'Changes in the Hymnal,' and reported by the Joint Committee:

"a. Hymn 315 to be printed as in the 'Hymnal' instead of as in 'Prayer-Book.'

"b. Hymn 378 to remain as in the 'Revised Hymnal,' being Hymn No. 63 of Prayer-Book.

"c. Hymn 393, substitute for this the Hymnal version. At the end of the Hymn add the 'Prayer-Book' version as Hymn 532.

"4. To make the following alterations, so that as to the Hymns named the revised Hymnal may correspond with the standard edition of the Hymnal:

"a. Hymn 219, verse 3, line 4, substitute 'might well' for 'would their.'

"b. Hymn 405, verse 2, line 1, substitute 'know that the Lord' for 'the Lord ye know.'

"c. Hymn 489, verse 3, line 3, substitute 'far-seeing' for 'foreseeing.'

"d. Hymn 496, insert fourth verse from Bickerseth, and omit fifth verse, as now printed.

"e. Hymn 502, verse 2, line 4, substitute the word 'sovereign' for the word 'gracious.'

"5. To make the corrections as proposed by the Hymnal Committee, and as set forth in the printed sheet, submitted to the Convention and headed 'corrections.'

"6. To allow no hymn to be added to those now in the revised Hymnal, and none to be omitted therefrom but such as are now authorized by this resolution.

(Signed) "CHARLES H. HALL,
NOAH HUNT SCHENCK,
GEORGE JARVIS GEER,
HUGH W. SHEFFEY,
HENRY E. PIERREPONT,
"Committee."

I ask that the House adopt the resolution, in order that it may be sent to the House of Bishops.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. These are all the changes proposed. I should like to say one single word. Three years ago, in looking at this Hymnal hastily, I offered a resolution asking the Committee on the Hymnal to consider the propriety of using a larger number of hymns for children. That was upon hasty examination; but having during the last year united in preparing a Hymnal for a public institution, with which I was connected, for children from six to eight years of age, I find that they have taken one hundred hymns from this Hymnal, showing that there is ample provision for our Sunday-schools, and therefore the Committee, I feel, are perfectly right in not increasing the number.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution reported by the Special Committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

TRIALS OF CLERGYMEN.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons:

Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 1, of Canon 3, of Title II., of the Digest be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. If a clergyman of this Church, belonging to any Diocese or missionary district, shall have conducted himself in any other Diocese or missionary district in such a way as to be liable to presentment under the provision of Canon 2 of Title II., the ecclesiastical authority thereof shall give notice of the same to the ecclesiastical authority where he is canonically resident, exhibiting, with the information given, reasonable ground for presuming its correctness.

"If the ecclesiastical authority, when thus notified, shall omit, for the space of three months, to proceed against the offending clergyman, he shall request the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or missionary district in which the offence or offences are imputed to have been committed, to proceed against him. It shall be within the power of the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or missionary district within which the offence or offences are alleged to have been committed to institute proceedings according to the mode provided by the Convention thereof, and the decision given shall be conclusive."

The PRESIDENT. The question is upon the adoption of the Canon.

The Canon was adopted.

SEPARATION OF SERVICES.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on Canons respecting a Commission on the Revision of Rubrics, to which are appended two resolutions. The first resolution is as follows:

"1. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it is the sense of this Convention that nothing in the present Order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other,

and either of them without the others. Provided, that, when used together, they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer."

The PRESIDENT. In order to simplify the question it would be better for the House to pass upon the first resolution at once, which has not been considered as debatable at all, leaving the second resolution for discussion.

The first resolution was agreed to.

RUBRICAL REVISION.

The Secretary read the second resolution, as follows:

"2. Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a Joint Commission, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven Laymen, be appointed (the Presbyters and Laymen to be chosen by ballot in the House of Deputies) to take into consideration the whole subject of Rubrical revision, among other things providing shortened and more varied services and a new Lectionary, and making such other suggestions as may seem judicious with respect to the services and offices of the Church, and to report to the next General Convention."

The PRESIDENT. The question is now upon the second resolution, and Mr. Meigs, of New Jersey, is entitled to the floor, which he obtained when the resolution was last under discussion.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. I have very few words to say on this resolution; but it does seem to me that it contains a power without any qualification whatever. It involves, it seems to me, no less than giving this commission the power to consider all the Rubrics in the Prayer-Book, and consequently those which relate to doctrine. We have already considered one proposition in reference to a Rubric, whether it changed doctrine or not, and we have had a very emphatic vote on that question. It seems to me that this resolution authorizes this commission to take into consideration the whole subject of Rubrical revision. If it does not authorize the commission to report a Rubric affecting doctrine, I do not know any language that would convey the idea. Now, sir, when I take up the preface to the Prayer-Book, I read:

"It is a most invaluable part of that blessed liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, that in his worship, different forms and usages may without offence be allowed, provided the substance of the faith be kept entire, and that, in every church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to doctrine must be referred to discipline; and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered"

That is to say, the discipline may be altered, but not the doctrine.

"may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, 'according to the various exigencies of times and occasions.'"

As I have said, it would authorize this Committee to report in favor of a new Prayer-Book. I am entirely unwilling that any Committee shall have power as unlimited as this might be; which might come before the next Convention and report, providing a new and different Prayer-Book. It is altogether too serious a question to be reposed in charge of a committee, and I am totally opposed to adopting such a proposition, as they can come before the next Convention with the authority that always goes with the report of a committee.

The Lay Deputy from South Carolina [Mr. McCrady] has, as I esteem it, laid down the proper principle upon which changes in the Rubrics affecting the doctrines should be made, and it is: that

when a change in a Rubric is proposed, it should come in only in the manner in which this proposed Rubric in the office of the Sacrament of Baptism was offered, and it should have the full and distinct consideration of this whole body. Our own Committee on Canons declined to express an opinion upon it, because they saw that it was too important a question for them to prejudge by a recommendation. That I esteem to be a correct principle, and I am totally opposed to reposing in any committee or any commission unlimited power to deal with these Rubrics. So far as it has been settled here that the offices and that the Prayer-Book are subject to revision, it is according to the language of the preface of the Prayer-Book, but not in reference to doctrine except under very solemn circumstances.

So, sir, I do not know that I shall occupy the time of the Convention any longer, except merely to state that I hope they will pause before they take a step which will result in such a radical and extensive change of our Book as would be possible under this resolution.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, viewing things from my standpoint, I do not think there has been one proposition made by this House so important as this. I know there is no proposition that will be so likely to give ease to the consciences of ministers and people as this will. I do believe its passage is vital. One minister has been deposed for violating a Rubric, the essential part of which our own Church declares he did not violate. He did all that our Church says is essential, and—

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I call the gentleman to order. He has no right to make such statements as that.

The PRESIDENT. The words must be taken down that are irregular or improper.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I will read from the Rubric in the Prayer-Book precisely what I mean. The Rubric for the private baptism of children, says: "But if they who bring the infant to the Church do make such uncertain answers to the minister's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (which are essential parts of baptism)," etc.

The point I want to make is this: We need a commission to determine the value or binding force of Rubrics. If the violation of a Rubric in which the essential parts are performed renders a man liable to be deposed, surely in the violation of other Rubrics where the essential part is not performed the same judgment and condemnation ought to follow.

If I understand aright the principles of our thoroughly Protestant Church, it has done all that legislation can do to prevent priest-craft. I can conceive of no additional safeguard needed to prevent its growth, yet some of these safeguards are so constantly disregarded that, if our clergy are brought to trial for breaking down these safeguards, this Church would not have a corporal's guard to-morrow. I hold that the Rubric indicating the time when infant baptism should be performed is of solemn import, and that the clergy have no discretion as to when it shall ordinarily be performed, except in the cases indicated in this Rubric:

"When there are children to be baptized, the parents or sponsors shall give knowledge thereof, before the beginning of Morning Prayer, to the Minister. And then the godfathers and godmothers, and the people with the children, must be ready at the font, either immediately after the last lesson at Morning Prayer, or else immediately after the last lesson at Evening Prayer, as the minister by his discretion shall appoint."

This Rubric was evidently prepared with great care, that Baptism might never be viewed as one of the most solemn acts of our Church; that we might never think that by the power of the priesthood solely a child can be spiritually regenerated and grafted into the family of Christ. The whole congregation is to be present to unite in that solemn act. If I understand the spirit of the Church, it asks its people to come and join with the minister in earnest prayer that God's Spirit may descend in all its fullness on that little one received by the minister in the name of Christ.

The proposed Commission will be most important to determine the meaning and binding force of Rubrics; for usages are growing up that may, if unchecked, weaken the foundations of the Church quite as much as what are called mediæval usages. I think we can all see how judicious men examining these Rubrics intelligently and thoroughly can make a report to the next Convention that will assist the Church to return to its primitive usages. It will surely show that in both of the sacraments restrictions are put upon the Presbyters, compelling them to have a certain number of praying people who by their "amen" will show that other prayers than those of an officiating priest have gone up to God and procured added power to the sacraments.

I was not among those who cared to have the proposition of the Committee on Canons passed, allowing alternate phrases, for I believe there is a higher law and a Rubric of common sense. I never yet have seen the minister who, if a child was to be baptised, far out on our frontier, and he had no Prayer-Book, would say, to a layman, "you must baptize that child, for I have no Prayer-Book. I doubt if we could find a man who would not show his manhood in such a case and show that the power of the Holy Ghost that made him a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ lifted him above all Rubrical hindrances. Surely there is a discretion lodged with every minister of Christ, and I do not think that in this Diocese, or in that with which I am connected, there ever will be a time when any minister of Christ who is really in earnest, and who is striving to do his duty to God and to man, will be tried for conscientiously making variations in the declaration of the effect of Baptism when he has complied with the essentials ordained by Christ. If Zacharias and Elizabeth had brought their babe to a minister of this Church for Christian baptism, would they have been refused because they desired Christian baptism only? They would undoubtedly have said, before that child was conceived prayer was offered that it might be a sanctified conception. Before the birth there was prayer, so that it came forth filled with the Holy Ghost.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that this House has considered and disposed of the question of the change of Rubrics in the Office of Holy Baptism. That, therefore, is no longer under discussion, and what is now under discussion is exclusive of that subject.

The PRESIDENT. A general revision is under discussion, and the gentleman will finish his speech by my watch before we can dispose of the point of order.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Thus interrupted, I think a speaker ought to have five minutes for every interruption.

The PRESIDENT. Go on, sir.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I will close by saying that this Commission, if appointed, will cause great easement of the conscience of many devoted ministers in this Church. Those of you who will be here three years hence will thank God that

the Committee on Canons brought in the proposed resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I rise simply to submit a motion that, unless otherwise ordered by the House, every speaker shall limit his remarks to five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Within five minutes I cannot allude to any point that has been made, and so well made, by the Lay Deputy from New Jersey [Mr. Meigs] as to the largeness of this Commission. I will pass on to ask the Convention to perceive the difficult position in which it will put itself by passing this resolution.

On Saturday it passed a so-called Canon on Ritual. That Canon enacted that, if any Bishop have reason to believe, or if complaint be made, that ceremonies symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines have been introduced, he shall act in a certain way. Do not the rites and ceremonies of the Church begin with its Rubrics as corrected by its articles? And if you say to-day that there is such uncertainty upon Rubrics as requires a commission, I ask how any Presbyter is to be presented under that Canon of Ritual? Does it not stultify the very position in which the Convention has put itself? Will not any Presbyter who is presented say, "The General Convention has passed a resolution that the whole Rubrics shall be revised; that there is no certain law in the Rubrics," and how can you convict him under Rubrics which are uncertain, where there is no law? Gentlemen, is not that a perfect denial of your Canon on Ritual? And when so much pains have been taken, so much effort and energy expended, in passing that Canon to which we look for peace, are you not throwing it away, utterly undoing the work you have done?

It may be said that this Commission is not to make law, it is only to report. I stand upon the ground that anything that this Convention does is not merely that perfunctory act of sending a thing down to ask other people's minds; it is a stamping upon whatever we do our opinion that the thing is so-and-so. I ask whether, after these long years passed in the use of this Prayer-Book, this Convention is at liberty to say, "We do not know what the law is; we must go to somebody to tell us what the law is"?

Again, it is too late at this moment, in another point of view, to ask us to do this thing. I do not know whom to vote for. Four ignorant laymen, who come from some distant part of the country, must have time to consider whom to vote for. We want to know who are the men in whom so tremendous a trust can be imposed. To ask us now, at the close of the session, to go into a ballot for a commission to be invested with such immense powers is unfair. It is not giving us an opportunity to put ourselves in possession of such information as will allow a proper judgment.

Again, I insist—and it cannot be too much insisted upon—that these Rubrics contain doctrine, or if not doctrine, at least they are authorized teachings. Look, for instance, at the Rubric in the Offertory. It is only recently that this great Church has awoke to the true nature of that Offertory. I remember when I was a boy, a few old men stood at the door to receive collections on no matter how important occasions. Instead of the solemn sacred nature of that offering, as we now understand it, that was the manner in which it was performed. We have learned better. So these Rubrics have a power of executing, and enforcing, and explaining themselves, and they may not do it to-day or in a short time; it takes a long time for us to know the value of some of them; but now you propose to unsettle everything—to throw all we have to the winds—and tell us that this is a Church

that has no law. Why I can hardly find words to express my astonishment. [Here the hammer fell.]

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not consider this a question of love or loyalty to the Church. Persons of all shades of opinion may entertain different views upon this subject. Now, sir, I thank God for one for the Catholic Liturgy that has come down to us from the ancient times; but I beg members to bear in mind that there are two things, first, that which is divine and settled, and, second, that which is human and alterable. I think the great mistake we are liable to make is that we are continually elevating that which is human, and placing it upon the platform of that which is divine and unalterable. In other words, you are liable to the temptation of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Now, I say Rubrics are not doctrine; they are not of Divine authority. There is an element which has come down to us, existing with the Word itself, the Apostolic ministry, the holy Sacraments, but no one will pretend to say that Liturgies or Rubrics, or any amendment of Rubrics, can possibly be raised to the same platform, and I say the mistakes we have made in time past in regard to the Methodists we are in danger of repeating this very day. I do not wish to reflect on the character of this Convention, but I say we have made a mistake. What did the Methodists desire to do? They were willing to receive our Sacraments; they were willing to receive Ordination at our hands; but our Conventions would insist that every line and letter of our Liturgy should be imposed upon them. We see a great deal of what is called—

The PRESIDENT. The time has come for the recess. The gentleman will have three minutes after the reassembling. ["Go on now."] The gentlemen will proceed if there be no objection.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. I only want to say a word for the old Evangelicals. We often hear it said "in essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty." I would ask, what in connection with the baptismal service is essential, except the inspired formulas in connection with the administration of the water? And yet we will not allow liberty in reference to these things; we put down our foot and say, "No; we are in essentials united, but in non-essentials no liberty whatever." I was glad for one that the proposition came up, at the beginning of this session, that we allow a member of the Russo-Greek Church to come among us and take his place here. It was a step in the right direction. I would not oppose it, while I could not conscientiously advocate it; but it is a step in the right direction, and it is a hopeful sign of the times. But, while we stretch out our hand on the right, shall we not also on the left? Shall we not pray in the language of the Liturgy, in reference to the Holy Catholic Church, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may not merely be bound together by an outward, historical tie, but also may be led into the way of truth. Old Bishop Hobart's motto was, "Evangelic truth; truth always before order." You recollect the sentiment of an Archbishop: "Give me leave to change twenty words in a certain service, and I will add twenty thousand members to our Church in less than a month." And yet, in things which involve no sacrifice of principle, we will not allow even that much liberty.

There are a few points which I should like to dilate upon, but I cannot in the limited time allowed. I thank the Convention for the attention with which they have received my remarks.

The PRESIDENT. The time for the recess has

arrived and the House takes a recess until two o'clock.

The House resumed its session at two o'clock P.M.

THE LECTONARY FOR LENT, ETC.

A message (No. 92) from the House of Bishops announced that that House did not concur in Message No. 91 from the House of Deputies, amending Message No. 60 from the House of Bishops relating to a Lectionary for Lent, and asked for a Committee of Conference on the subject, and appointed as such Committee on its part the Bishop of Texas, the Bishop of Pennsylvania, the Bishop of Maine.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that we appoint a Committee of Conference as requested by the Bishops, but I do not wish to be on the Committee.

The motion was agreed to; and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Beach, of New York, Rev. Dr. Fulton, of Alabama, and Mr. Sheffey, of Virginia, the conferees on the part of the House of Deputies.

TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

A message (No. 93) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the General Convention will adjourn on Tuesday evening, after the reading of the Pastoral Letter."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I move that we concur in that resolution, and I will make a verbal report on behalf of the Committee of Conference. The other House expect to nominate to us a Missionary Bishop this afternoon. There will probably be another, and they have not heard yet of the acceptance of the Bishop-elect of China. There is other business which will make it impossible for the Bishops to have the Pastoral Letter read earlier than to-morrow evening. It will be read in this building, unless otherwise ordered. I move that we concur in the resolution.

Several MEMBERS. At what hour to-morrow evening?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. At half-past seven. We shall be very glad to have the mind of the House as to the place. Most of the gentlemen who go up town find it inconvenient to return here.

The resolution was concurred in.

RUBRICAL REVISION.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution for the appointment of a Commission on Rubrical Revision is before the House.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Believing, sir, that no benefit will flow from a further protracted discussion of the matter, I move that the vote be taken in fifteen minutes.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I suggest a motion to lay it on the table, so as to test the sense of the House.

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. Very well.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Mr. President, in the debate upon this subject, the consideration of its merits has become so involved with other considerations, the lateness of the hour, the thinness of the Convention, the difficulty, possibly, of having it acted upon, as so great a matter as this should be, by the House of Bishops, that I move now that the consideration of the resolution be indefinitely postponed. I do not understand this as necessarily cutting short the debate.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is debatable.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I shall be very sorry to have the resolution rejected entirely upon its merits. It seems to me that it deserves some consideration, and ought to have it in a fuller House and with more time and less impatience than we all naturally feel at this hour of the

session. It is a measure which, in my judgment, must come sooner or later. The only point is when?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Let the motion be, that, on account of the lateness of the hour, this matter be referred to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I think it better to adhere to my original motion that the resolution of Rubrical revision be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If this motion be voted down, I will move then to refer it to the next General Convention, the rule being that a motion to defer to a time certain follows a motion to indefinitely postpone.

The PRESIDENT. To postpone to a time certain comes first.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I stand corrected. The gentleman from North Carolina moves an indefinite postponement of the subject of Rubrical revision. I move in lieu of that to refer the matter to the next General Convention; that is, a time certain.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I trust that motion will not prevail. We do not want to unsettle the mind of the Church on this subject. It will be like the adversary going about to seek whom he may devour. We are unwilling to entertain the idea. If we appoint a commission of this kind, they will be bound to see if there is not some screw loose somewhere.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Is the motion to postpone indefinitely amendable?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I do not move to amend it. The privileged motions are, first, to lay on the table; second, to postpone to a time certain; third, to postpone indefinitely; and the rule says that these motions shall have priority in the order named. I therefore move, as a privileged motion, that this matter be referred to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. ROGERS, of Texas. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman says he moves to defer to a time certain; but it must be a time certain under the control of this Convention; and the next General Convention is no such time certain.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. What motions are before the House, may I ask?

The PRESIDENT. The motion I have heard is the motion to postpone indefinitely the resolution before the House. The motion that has precedence over that is to postpone to a time certain instead of indefinitely.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It is a common practice of the Parliament of Great Britain, instead of moving an indefinite postponement of a matter, to move to postpone it until after the adjournment—to postpone it to a day beyond the session—to kill it; and if the Parliament of Great Britain, under a motion to postpone to a time certain, can postpone to a day that must fall beyond their session, it is competent for us to move here to postpone a matter to the next Convention.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I thought I heard a motion to lay the whole matter on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair has heard no such motion.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. One session of Parliament may refer a matter to another session of Parliament. This House is not like that.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I say it is the daily practice of the Parliament of Great Britain to postpone a motion to a day when no Parliament can be in session or in existence.

The PRESIDENT. Certainly; but that does not

come into this matter of a privileged question under our rules.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The reason that motion is made in the British Parliament is in order to get in a motion which takes precedence of other motions. It is a privileged motion to postpone to a day certain, and it is perfectly competent for any man to move in this House that the consideration of any matter be postponed to the first day of the next meeting, and it is in order and the effect is to kill the proposition. It is done in parliamentary bodies. It is done in England constantly. Is not my motion in order?

The PRESIDENT. I do not think it comes within the privileged motions.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Then I have a word to say, and for the purpose of saying a word I appeal from the decision, though I do not mean to press the appeal. The motion is to postpone indefinitely. The Chair has ruled that a motion to postpone to the next General Convention is not a motion to postpone to a time certain, to which I submit. I therefore wish to say simply that I am opposed to the motion for indefinite postponement, for the reason that it amounts to saying that this Convention never wish to consider the subject of Rubrical revision, that they wish never to hear of it. The main reason for not acting on it is that the lateness of the session precludes us from giving it that attention which it deserves. I am not in favor even of that, for there is no question of detail; there is no question of deliberation; it is a simple question whether this House will let a body of men present to the next General Convention for their consideration what any member of this House can do to-day. If it was not for the rule against the introduction of new matter, any man in this House could offer to the Convention to-day the largest revision of Rubrics, and ask for its adoption as a proposed amendment to be sent down to the Dioceses. This proposes, instead of leaving it to somebody to prepare it without organization, that we organize the best Committee we can have to present the subject to the next General Convention for their consideration, and if they see fit to propose it to the next Convention after that they can do so. If they do not like the looks of it, they can throw it on the table, or postpone it, or do nothing with it. It can do no harm. Gentlemen suggest that a motion to revise the statutes is a motion that they are uncertain now. That idea, I say, is absurd, with due respect. A motion to revise any code of Rubrics, laws, or legislation, is a motion which involves one fact, and one only, that they are not absolutely infallible and absolutely perfect, it involves that, and nothing more and nothing less.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I want to say only two words. I move that all the amendments, except the original resolution from the Committee, be laid on the table.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. There are no amendments.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. There is a motion for indefinite postponement.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. That is not an amendment.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I move that the motion for indefinite postponement be laid on the table, so that we may get at the original proposition. I say that, if this Convention pass this resolution, it is simply leading to confusion and to uncertainty for the next three years; it is unsettling the Prayer-Book. We elect fourteen men by ballot out of this House upon the question of Rubrics, which I, as a rector of this Church, declare is the most difficult question that can be brought forward, the

most extensive, and the most wonderful question. To take fourteen men by ballot out of this House, to appoint a Commission on this point, would be properly met by a motion to send the sexton out of the door of this House, and to take the fourteen next men he met on the street to do the best thing.

I hope that this House, knowing the mischievous nature of this commission, will lay on the table everything except the original proposition, which comes down to us from the Committee, and give us a chance to settle that, and to tell this Church that we are not going to appoint a commission of ignorance, incompetence, and injudiciousness upon the Rubrics of the Church, many of which have come down to us from the time of the Apostles.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I move to lay the whole subject on the table.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Let us have the direct vote, in order that the Church may know what is the sense of this House.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to lay the whole subject on the table.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I rise to a point of order. My point is, that by a resolution of this House more than twenty minutes ago, we agreed that the vote should be taken in fifteen minutes. I hope the vote will be taken directly. I intend to vote "no."

Mr. WILDER, of Minnesota. I made the motion to take the vote in fifteen minutes, but I had not the floor. Another gentleman had it and I subsided.

The PRESIDENT. No such motion was put. It is now moved to lay the whole subject on the table.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I understood distinctly that motion was made by a reverend gentleman from Wisconsin, to lay on the table the question of indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT. But another motion has been made since to lay the whole matter on the table.

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. The wish, in this part of the House, is to have a direct vote on the question. I hope it will be so settled that we can have a direct vote. We want a vote either "no" or "aye."

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. In this part of the House we do not want a direct vote, because the proposition has not been discussed thoroughly, and therefore the only course is, if it is not to be acted upon now, to lay it on the table.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. What is the motion before us?

The PRESIDENT. To lay on the table.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I wish to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that a motion to lay a motion for indefinite postponement on the table is not in order. If the House desire to resort to the motion to lay on the table, that motion would take precedence of the motion to indefinitely postpone, and must apply to the original resolution. That motion the gentleman from Pittsburgh has submitted.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. The question being now open to debate, I desire to say a few words.

Mr. CASE, of Pittsburgh. Will the gentleman allow me to ask the Chair a question. To what length of time is debate now limited?

The PRESIDENT. Five minutes by each speaker. Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. Mr. President, what is it that is proposed in this resolution? It does seem to me that this Convention imagines that when it adjourns, it in the future is afraid to trust any other Convention? Why? What is the proposition? That a commission of twenty-one wise and

discreet men, to be chosen by yourselves, shall make a report containing in any event vastly valuable information to the Church, at the next session of the General Convention. It binds nobody. It pledges no one by way of committal to any of the recommendations of that commission, because we do not know now what the Commission may report. When it comes up at the next session of the General Convention, the Convention then in being—and I trust that it will be as wise, that it will be as conservative, that it will be as true to all the teachings of the Prayer-Book and of the Church as we are—when that report comes before as wise, as loyal, and as true a body of men as we are, that body will then say, "We approve this suggestion," "We approve that suggestion." And upon that proposition a majority of all the Lay Deputies and of all the Clerical Deputies must be had, and then the House of Bishops are to say, "We approve this suggestion in concurrence with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies." What then? Then for three years more the entire mind of this great Church, from California to Maine, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Lakes, will consider again the proposed points of Rubrical revision. In the name of all that is just or according to common sense, if at the end of nine years this Church, thus advised, thus cautioned, and thus put upon its guard, chooses to say this or that change shall be made, may it not then be properly made?

I say again, I am not afraid to trust this noble old Church of ours. I am not afraid to trust it in its constitutional modes of acting. It is not dependent on the will of party or the will of man here or there; but the consentaneous will, three times expressed, of a great Church, involving its usefulness, its success, its effort, to the devotion and glory and honor of God.

Representing as I do the sentiment of the old Diocese of Virginia, I may be pardoned for making one remark. It is this: Again has Virginia been twitted for her old back policy; but in this demonstration that I now make I place Virginia alongside of the progress of the Church in favor of developing the power and resources of the Church for its ultimate purposes; and permit me to say that if, in the providence of God, calamity should befall this loved Church of ours, if the storm should come, and the gallant old ship should, as God forefend, ever be driven upon the breakers—mark what I say—Virginia, the Diocese of ancient tradition, will in that hour of trial be found opposed, as she has always been, to extremes on the one side and extremes on the other, standing nearest to the mast, if the ship ever goes down.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. As well as I can in the five minutes allotted to me, I propose to meet the argument urged this morning by the very eloquent Lay Deputy from South Carolina [Mr. Smith]. He argued that if we passed this resolution, we should stultify our previous action in passing the Canon on Ritual. I desire, if I may, to turn the argument against him in this way: We stultify ourselves in having passed that Canon; if we do not now pass this; for what was that Canon? It was a Canon for the better enforcement of the Ritual law of the Church. That Canon did not make Ritual law. It provided a method for the quicker enforcement of law already existing. That is the true character of that Canon. Things that were lawful before are lawful now. Things that are unlawful now were unlawful then. It is, in other words, precisely parallel to the measure lately passed in England known as the Public Worship Bill; and what was the state of things there? The moment the Public Worship Bill had been passed, the need of a Commission for Rubrical revision was at once ap-

parent; and so it has come to pass with us. The moment we passed our Canon, which might properly be entitled "a Canon for the better enforcement of the Ordination Vow," that moment we saw the absolute necessity of ascertaining what the Rubrical law of the Church is.

And let High Churchmen in this body disabuse themselves of the idea that this measure is being pushed by radicals for radical ends. Nothing of the sort. There is no desire on the part of the promoters of this measure to impoverish the Liturgical worship of this Church. Their only desire is that we may avail ourselves of its riches. Their only desire is that this admirable wonderful service may be better adapted to the needs of this land; and there is no other way in which it can be done save in this way of Rubrical revision.

Six years ago the discerning eye of the now Bishop of Long Island, then a member of this House—and I may, without impropriety, refer to a member of the other House—saw that this was the only proper course, and he advocated it here. He was met, if I remember rightly, by the learned and venerable Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin (Dr. Adams) with the rejoinder that in six years it was hoped the trouble would be over, which his measure was intended to meet. Sir, those six years are past, and the trouble is still more aggravated than then. The proper remedy was then, and is now, Rubrical revision, carefully, lovingly, and studiously, of the text.

Do you speak of hasty action? Can any action that extends over a period of nine years, and tentative at that, be properly called hasty?

But now, sir, I have only a few moments of my five minutes left. Allow me also to try and meet the argument of another Lay Deputy from South Carolina [Mr. McCrady], from whom I always differ with pain, and consequently am almost always in pain, for we are almost always differing. [Laughter.]

He argued that the measure is unconstitutional. How unconstitutional? What method could be more constitutional than this? We do not even propose a change in the Rubrics; we simply propose a Commission to enquire whether any change, and if any, what change, is needed to make the Common Prayer-Book better meet the needs of this Church; and he says, if we are to do it at all, let us do it piecemeal. I ask the gentleman if he had an old family mansion falling out of repair, is that the method in which he would go to work to remedy the evil? No; he would call in a skilled architect; he would say: What is needed to make my old family mansion weather-proof; give me your plan, now; I will do it; and put it in such shape that I shall not have to touch it for thirty years to come." We want, sir, to put the worship of this Church in such a shape that it shall not have to be touched for one hundred years to come.

I know not whether this measure is destined to meet with success or failure, but I know this, that the minorities of the present are the majorities of the future; and feeling almost as confident that before this Church has completed the first century of its independent life this measure or some measure kindred to it will be passed, as that this Church will be in existence then, I feel the hope, and shall not allow myself to be discouraged, whatever may be the fate of this measure. But depend upon it, it is not a radical measure; it is conceived in the true spirit of conservatism, that spirit which we find illustrated by God working in Nature, where we see that everywhere the law of life is conservation by repair.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President, the gentleman from Virginia put the true state of the case before us when he said that if this is to be done, it is to be done by the consecutive good-will of three

different Conventions. I agree to that. Consequently, the portion of his argument, which was that because it goes to two more Conventions we are to send it regardless of our own opinions, is not good. If we, to-day, believe that the Prayer-Book should be amended—that its Rubrics should be changed—then we are exactly right in sending it to a commission. But the gentleman has said that we are one of three, and so we are, and we are not to delegate our opinions or our authority to the next Convention, nor the next after. If we believe that the Prayer-Book should be amended, we should send it to a commission; but if we, exercising our own rights and our own duties, first, as representatives of this Church here; second, as members of this Church at large; third, as clergymen in this Church, believe that it is better now than it can be made, that it is unsafe to send it to a commission to hunt up its faults, to compromise with this party and with that—I say if we believe that the history of the Irish Church is such that it is not exactly safe to part our Prayer-Book into anybody's hands, if we believe that the faith kept in the old garment is better than it would be distilled into a new; if we believe that the house which the gentleman speaks of does not need repairing, that it has stood as it is almost one hundred years and is sound now; if we believe that all tearing down and tinkering is wrong, then resting upon our duty we refuse to send it to a commission. I say to you now that the first thing that ever attracted my attention to the Episcopal Church was that its faith was done up in sound words and sound forms, and I knew just where to find it.

There is another fact. You say you are not going to touch the faith, but you may. You may take out the soul from the body of the Prayer-Book by these Rubrics; you may do it in spite of the text. Allow now this to be said and now that, put in this Rubric a little different and that a little different, and the very congregations will not recognize the old Prayer-Book in what is read and prayed in their hearing and by themselves.

I love the Prayer-Book; I love it as it is. I hope to live and to die by it, and I will never raise my hand, as I now understand the case, to send it to any Commission on earth. If there is a word of change needed, let that change come before the Convention; let it decide that it is needed, and send it down to the next General Convention with its approval upon it, and then, when it shall have passed through the Dioceses from end to end of this country, and come up at the next General Convention; if that Convention believes with the one that sends it down, the change is made, and we know what we are doing. But when this comes in here three years hence, with a Commission's report upon it, every member of that Commission is pledged to it, and they come here, they say, in the spirit of compromise. I say in the spirit of destruction. When the time shall come for voting upon this great, this most momentous question, in my mind, that has been before this Convention from the first to the last, I hope the voice will be one that shall tell from Maine to California that the Prayer-Book is safe in the hands of its friends and the Church.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, it seems to me a very great pity that some remarks made in favor of this measure should have evidently, in the mind of the Convention, told against it. Certain speeches that were made have left the impression that the object of the appointment of this Commission was in some way to touch the baptismal service. I am free to say that if I thought this Commission was to be appointed with any such intention, or if I supposed, provided it were

appointed with any such intention, that it would be possible for this Church to throw the slightest doubt upon the great doctrine of baptismal regeneration, I should be utterly and totally opposed to it.

It may be supposed, on the other hand, that the fact of my supporting this may be because I fancy that in some way some new doctrine in the other direction may be introduced into the Prayer-Book. Allow me to say for myself how far I speak for others. I can say that I want no alteration in the Book of Common Prayer doctrinally in any direction whatsoever. I accept it, and have always accepted it *ex animo*, from the beginning to the end. I never have to supplement it in any direction, even in the deepest recesses of my own heart. I suppose that the object of appointing this Commission is nothing of that sort. It is neither in one direction nor in the other, but to meet a difficulty which, put it aside from us as we may, unquestionably exists, and I believe that this difficulty, which I will speak of in a moment, is the cause of one of the troubles that exist in our Church at the present day.

Have we, or have we not, a distinct law of worship in this Church? And I answer—and I believe that there is no one here but will agree with me—I answer no, for if anybody pretends to say that the Rubric, the Book of Common Prayer, prescribes a system of worship, he is only saying what there is not a clergyman in this Church who does not assert by his acts that he does not believe. It was an instance of confusion on this subject which prevails even amongst those who are supposed to understand the matter the best, that the Bishops when they sent down the amendment to the Canon of Ritual, actually proposed—or at least it was proposed in the Committee of Conference—that there should be in this Church of ours, in its worship, nothing done which was not ordained or authorized in the Book of Common Prayer; and from the bowing in the Creed at the name of our Blessed Saviour up to the use of any vestments whatsoever, we are doing things which are not ordained or authorized in our Book of Common Prayer. Why, Mr. President, if the Book of Common Prayer be a directory of public worship, actually we have no right to use even a surplice, a stole, a cassock, or bands, or anything else. Everybody knows that we have no distinct law of worship.

Put it off if you please; if this is not the time; if there are hidden difficulties which people know of, and which are not upon the surface in this matter, it may be right to postpone it; but it seems to me that to vote down this resolution is to declare against the solitary measures which have been brought forward in this House, which shows, as the Clerical Deputy from Massachusetts said the other day, anything like true statesmanship.

Rev. Mr. HASKINS, of Long Island. I believe, sir, contrary to the opinion of the last speaker, that this commission changing Rubrics will touch doctrine, as the doctrine of regeneration in baptism. I believe it in this way. We have had it brought before us by the Deputy from Pennsylvania [Mr. Welsh], that the Rubric requires baptism to be performed after the first and second lesson of morning service. Suppose that Rubric be changed, so as to allow that baptism be done in a corner, or, as is done now frequently, between services, or after service, will it not in the course of a few years drop out entirely the belief in the doctrine of regeneration on the part of this Church? As an illustration, I would say that some twenty years ago, I was in the Diocese of Ohio, and I requested the rector of a church to allow me to stand sponsor for a child to be baptized, and to present that child that afternoon for baptism. He said, "Yes, bring the child at one o'clock." I told him the service

was at three o'clock, and I wished to present the child after the second lesson of the afternoon service, as the Rubric required. Said he, "It is never so done here." "Very well," said I, "I am a rubrical man, and I wish so to present that child to be baptized." "Very well, sir, we will do it." He gave out notice in the morning, at the time of giving the notices, that the usual monthly baptisms would be held at one o'clock, and also after the second lesson in the afternoon service, as the Rubric required, and he was very glad to say that the Church had appointed that Rubric, and his attention had been called to it, and therefore he would baptize children in the afternoon at that time. I presented the child, and it was done. I maintain that at those churches where the child is not baptized after the second lesson and before the congregation, who ought to join in the prayer, where the thing is done in a corner, gives the whole doctrine the go-by; the congregation do not know as to what the Church believes and holds as to the doctrine of baptism. Our children are brought up without the knowledge of the true interpretation of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. Mr. President, the argument of the reverend gentleman who has just spoken is not against the wisdom of the appointment of this Commission, but against the wisdom of acquiescing in some possible recommendation of theirs. Therefore it must fall to the ground. No proposition to alter Rubrics is before the House. The question is simply, shall we appoint a commission to take this whole matter into consideration, a commission of wise men to deliberate what changes, if any, are practicable and advisable?

Sir, there are many on this floor, I doubt not, who, like myself, are in favor of this proposition were it to be decided upon its merits, who yet may be obliged to vote against it, inasmuch as at this hour of the session we are not prepared carefully and deliberately to acquiesce in its terms. The resolution provides that we shall, by ballot, select seven clergymen and seven laymen, who shall be charged with this matter. It is a very important matter, and one that we should undertake with exceeding deliberation, to select fourteen such men. I know of no body of men proposed to be appointed by this House whom I should feel disposed to select without some delay, without much care and scrutiny. Therefore I say that many who are in favor of the proposition may be obliged to vote against it on that ground simply. If, however, it shall pass on its merits—and I do not propose to debate its merits—perhaps the difficulty may be got over in this way, by deciding now upon the Commission, and fixing an hour to-morrow when we shall go into this ballot, giving us twenty-four hours to think and consult with each other, in order to select, if possible, a body of men who shall know something of the doctrine of the Church, who shall know something of its practice, who shall know something of its needs, who shall be fit and proper men to be charged with this most important work.

I hope that we shall not let this matter go by, for sooner or later it will come up before us, and the sooner we begin to think upon it, the better. Some gentlemen are in favor of individual concrete propositions being brought up, and decided individually on this floor; but we know that these propositions all originate in the minds of single individuals who have their own favorite schemes to further. Therefore, they do not consider the proper relativity of things; they are only in favor of this one proposition, without considering how it may affect, immediately or remotely, a score of others. That is one argument why the matter should be undertaken by men who

will have the full subject in charge, who will do everything with deliberation, and where the wisdom of each one will be supplemented by the wisdom of the others; and then, if they shall agree upon their result, still this Convention—not now, but hereafter—will decide on each one separately on its merits. Surely it is not fair by a vote to lay on the table a proposition like this, which so many on this floor have so nearly at heart!

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of hesitation that I venture to say one word that would bring me in conflict with one so skilful in debate as the Rev. Deputy from Wisconsin; but when I heard his statement of the grounds upon which he intended to support this measure, and the advantage that would result from it, I must confess that I was greatly surprised. I have always understood from the expression of his views, and from the general idea that I had of the views of many who are supposed to be in sympathy with him, that what they desired was not a rigid law of uniformity, but something that would allow freedom of opinion and freedom of practice. But I have heard him here distinctly assert that we have no law or definite rule of worship in the Church, and that it is the intention and design by means of this Commission to get a system of Rubrics which will define just what a person shall do and just what a person shall not; just the garments, for instance—for he specified the garments—he shall wear, and just what he shall not. He did not use those words, but by illustrating by means of vestments, it is a fair inference from his speech.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. It was not my idea.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. Still I inferred it, and I think it would be inferred by the Convention, from the gentleman's statement, that something more precise, defining just what we are to do and what we are not to do, was sought. I felt satisfied that the general sense of this House, the general sense of the Church, would be opposed to any system of Rubrics which would so accurately define or lay down laws to bind us in the conduct of public service; that there is under our present system ample law to hold us to a general course of uniformity; that there is under it also ample liberty and toleration for different opinions. I am utterly averse, therefore, after spending so long a time as we have here in bringing things to a settlement, and determining some point, to crowning the work of the Convention by voting that we upset everything and leave all in confusion.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons relative to Rubrical revision.

The resolution was rejected, there being on a division, ayes 53, noes 66.

GERMAN PRAYER-BOOK.

A message (No. 94) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in message No. 90 from the House of Deputies, continuing the Joint Committee on the German Prayer-Book, and in message No. 92, from the House of Deputies, appointing a Joint Committee on Publication of the Journal, and the House of Bishops named, as the member of the said Joint Committee, on its part, the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania.

BISHOP OF NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

A message (No. 95) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption, by that House, of the following resolutions:

"Resolved, 1st. That the Territory of New Mexi-

to is hereby detached from the jurisdiction of the Missionary Bishop of Colorado.

"2d. That the Territory of Arizona be detached from the jurisdiction of the Missionary Bishop of Nevada.

"3d. The Territories of New Mexico and Arizona are hereby constituted the jurisdiction of a Missionary Bishop, and the House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has nominated as Missionary Bishop for New Mexico and Arizona, the Rev. William F. Adams, Rector of St. Paul's Church, New Orleans, in the Diocese of Louisiana."

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I move that the formal part of the message of the House of Bishops be concurred in, and that the House proceed to the election of the Missionary Bishop at once.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I offer an amendment fixing it for five o'clock. Unless we get through a great deal of business to-day, we shall have to remain till Wednesday night. If we work to-day, we can get through to-morrow night.

Several DEPUTIES. Say half-past four.

Rev. Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I do hope the motion made by the Clerical Deputy from Louisiana will prevail. I myself am compelled to leave the House permanently in the course of an hour at most, and I should like to give my testimony in favor of the nominee before I leave the House, and I should like to have the pleasure of voting for him. There are several others I know who are going. I am the only Lay Representative from our Diocese now here, and to tell you the truth, I stayed over from last night to this time for the express purpose of saying something on this subject and voting on it.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Will not four o'clock do?

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Is the mover willing to suspend the rule about closed doors in this case?

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. I am.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Very well. Then I am willing.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I second the motion to suspend the rule as to closed doors.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It would be invidious, after having sat with closed doors on other gentlemen who have been sent down to us, to remove it now. Having adopted it, we ought to stick to it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It would be a very dangerous precedent, because we should not know what we are doing.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to suspend the rule which requires the House to sit with closed doors on the nomination of a Bishop.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I am willing, as a compromise, to fix on half-past four.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. Here are gentlemen going away.

The PRESIDENT. The motion is that the House proceed to the election of a Missionary Bishop at half-past four. ["Four." "Four."]

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I am willing to make it four o'clock.

Mr. RACE, of Louisiana. I move an amendment to go into the election at half-past three o'clock.

Rev. Dr. LEWIN, of Maryland. I move to proceed immediately.

The PRESIDENT. The original motion was to proceed immediately. The amendment is to proceed at four o'clock. The question will be taken on the motions in their order. The first question will be on fixing four o'clock.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The question now is on fixing

half-past three for the election of the Missionary Bishop to New Mexico and Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

SPANISH PRAYER-BOOK.

Rev. Dr. WILSON, of Central New York. I move that the Committee on the Translation of the Prayer-Book into the Spanish Language be enlarged by the addition of Mr. Stark, of Connecticut.

The PRESIDENT. I will state that Mr. Stark's name was accidentally left off the Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The nomination will be sent to the House of Bishops, because they have already acted on our previous nomination.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. There is an order for the day for this time, but we cannot do anything with it in ten minutes, which is all we have left. Let it be read, however.

The House proceeded to consider the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Sections 2 and 3 of Canon 4, of Title II, 'Of Differences between Ministers and their Congregations, and of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection,' be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The five Presbyters thus designated shall constitute a Board of Reference to consider such controversy; and shall meet in the city or county in which such rector or assistant minister lives, or elsewhere, as the parties may agree. It shall be the duty of such Board to adjust, if possible, the differences without dissolving the connection between the rector or assistant minister, or the vestry or congregation; and for this purpose the Board is empowered to recommend terms of settlement; and if after hearing such allegations and proofs as the parties may submit, a majority of the Presbyters, the whole Board being present, shall be of opinion that there is no favorable termination of such controversy, and that a dissolution of the connection between such rector or assistant minister and his parish or congregation, is necessary to restore the peace of the Church, and promote its prosperity, such Presbyters shall recommend to the Bishop that such minister shall be required to relinquish his connection with said Church or parish, on such conditions as may appear to them proper and reasonable, including the adjustment of all pecuniary claims between the parties.

"Sec. 3. If the Bishop approve the recommendation of the Presbyters, and if the rector or assistant minister refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop and Presbyters, made in pursuance of such recommendation, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial functions within the Diocese, until he shall retract his refusal; and if he persist in his refusal, it shall be the duty of the Bishop to dissolve the connection between the said rector and vestry or congregation; or if the vestry or congregation shall refuse to comply with any such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention until they shall have retracted their refusal."

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. We concurred in certain amendments sent down by the Bishops as an independent proposition, and we then presented on our part certain amendments to the Canon. I should like to know which this is.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I will say that the Canon was reported by us, and then re-committed on the motion, I think, of the gentleman from Texas. Inasmuch as I believe there will be something said in reference to it on the other side, I

should like to put before the House the precise action of the Committee.

With reference to Section 1, a proposition came from the House of Bishops to amend the phraseology in the fifth and sixth lines, beginning with the words, "make application to the Bishop of the Diocese, who shall"; they proposed to amend that so as to read, "may refer the matter to the Bishop of the Diocese, who may." That was the first action of the Committee. The House of Bishops also proposed an amendment of Section 3, providing that if the minister shall not retract his refusal, and shall continue not to retract, he shall then be liable to have his connection entirely severed.

The Committee, however, have introduced other amendments. In Section 2 they propose to introduce after the word "controversy" in the third line, a provision requiring the Board to meet in the city or county of the clergyman who constitutes one party to the suit so as to make it convenient to him, and not permit him to be dragged to inconvenient and perhaps impossible distances, involving him in such ruinous expense that he would be obliged to throw up the case rather than meet it.

Then, again, the Committee propose to amend Section 1 by requiring that the whole Board shall be present when its decision is rendered. As the section stands now, it is only required that "the majority of the Presbyters shall be of opinion that there is no hope," etc.

Previous to that we have introduced an amendment that the whole Board shall be present at the final decision.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Is it required that the whole Board shall hear the evidence?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. No. That was not before the Committee, and it was suggested only after the Committee made their last report, and the matter went on the Calendar. The Committee also propose to insert in that section a provision by which this Board of Reference shall be enabled to mediate between the parties, and if possible, settle the case without a dissolution of the connection. If, however, they find that to be impossible, if all being present, when the finding is given, a majority shall be of opinion that there is no hope of a favorable termination of the controversy, that a dissolution is necessary; then they shall recommend, etc., as the Canon goes on to state. Only that in the second section they may provide for the settlement of outstanding pecuniary claims, which may exist between the parties. A case was brought to the knowledge of the Committee in which there were large arrears, and still the vestry insisted on cutting the tie, leaving the clergyman to get his money as best he could. We thought it was right to provide for that in the final action of the Board of Enquiry.

The Committee also propose to amend Section 3, but that amendment came up in their previous report. The Board having made their recommendation to the Bishop, if the rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the requirement of the Bishop made in pursuance of this recommendation, then the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of his ministerial functions, and if he persists in his refusal, then to sever the connection between him and his parish. The Committee have endeavored to ameliorate the Canon in the interest of justice in every direction. As to the matter referred to by the Deputy from Long Island, it was not brought up until the report was made.

The PRESIDENT. The hour has arrived for going into the election of a Missionary Bishop, under the message from the House of Bishops.

The doors having been closed, the House proceeded to consider the nomination of a Missionary Bishop for New Mexico and Arizona. On the elec-

tion of Rev. Mr. Adams, of Louisiana, when the doors were opened, the result was announced as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE—38 Dioceses, all in the affirmative.

LAY VOTE—26 Dioceses, 26 votes, none in the negative.

NEW LECTIONARY.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I beg leave to submit the following report from the Committee on Conference regarding the Lectionary:

"The Committee of Conference on the disagreement of the two Houses on the subject of the Lectionary, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the following be proposed as an amendment by way of addition to the Eighth Article of the Constitution, to wit:

"Provided, however, that the General Convention shall have power from time to time to amend the Lectionary, but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and by a majority of all the dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the House of Deputies cause the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution to be made known to the several Dioceses, according to the Constitution and Canons of the Church.

"ALEXANDER GREGG,

"Chairman of the Committee on the part of the House of Bishops.

"ALFRED B. BEACH,

"Chairman of the Committee on the part of the House of Deputies."

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Is not that exactly what we voted against a little while ago?

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. The words are "to amend the Lectionary." That means the present Lectionary. Would that permit the addition of a Lectionary specially for Lent? Could we do it under the Constitution?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. If I am not mistaken, the point was made a little while ago in this House, that this gave to the Convention the right at each session, provided it passed by a majority, to alter or change the order of lessons. That point remains, and I only bring to the notice of the House whether they intend to recede from the position they then took.

Mr. DE ROSSET, of North Carolina. I am utterly opposed to this measure, and I shall be very sorry if it is adopted. It provides for the alteration of the Book of Common Prayer so far as the Lectionary is concerned, and I call for a vote by Orders on the question.

The PRESIDENT. There was another matter before us, and this could only come up, I think, by general consent, and be passed upon. If it is to be argued, and the vote taken by Dioceses and Orders, we must go back to the business which was interrupted by the election of a Missionary Bishop.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. I trust that general consent will be given to carry this on, because I am sure now it will be rather quiet, and when brought up a third time it will begin to be wearisome to the House. If I may go on, I will answer the question just put to the gentlemen on the Committee on Conference.

Rev. Mr. MARPLE, of Central Pennsylvania. I move a suspension of the order of business to dispose of this matter.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to suspend the order of business before the House when we went

into secret session, in order to take up the report of the Committee of Conference on the Lectionary.

The motion was agreed to.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the Convention more than a very few moments, and I trust that I shall be able, if I can make myself heard, to remove from a part, at least, the difficulties that are pressed on the minds of some of our friends. The reason why it was felt by the Committee of Conference—and they reported unanimously—that this was the best method to proceed was, first, because a revision of our Lectionary is almost or quite universally felt to be a necessary thing; and, secondly, because necessary though it be, it was also felt to be an exceedingly difficult thing. It is almost impossible for scholars and gentlemen in their studies to furnish a Lectionary for the Christian year. It may all seem very beautiful and profitable to the student, but when it comes to be used actually in practical life, it may not prove to be quite so edifying to the congregations and people. Therefore, it will be necessary, in order to the final adoption of a Lectionary, that there should be a tentative process, a trial of what we do, in order that we may be able to discover whether it will be as perfect in practice as it has been supposed to be in theory. Now, it would be a very undesirable thing if in this tentative process and to its success it should become necessary every three years to change the Constitution or to change the Book of Common Prayer. This would gravitate us into a bad habit.

In other words, if we were to take the resolution which we passed to-day, and to which the House of Bishops disagreed, the result would be, that we would three years hence have a Lectionary, and then because in some particular it was not felt to be all that we desired, we should take another three years to change the Lectionary, and so three years afterwards, and so on, and we should be perpetually at work on the Lectionary by a constitutional process.

The Committee on the part of the House of Bishops felt that with the safeguards thrown around this matter, requiring not merely a majority of the House of Bishops but a majority of the Bishops entitled to seats in that House, including the Foreign Missionary Bishops, the Domestic Missionary Bishops, the Bishops who were actually assembled, and the Bishops who may from sickness or otherwise be absent, and requiring also a majority of this House, voting by orders, for any change, even of a single chapter or a single verse, that every safeguard was thrown around it that could possibly be desired. I shall not advocate the measure further. To my own mind it appears to be exceedingly necessary, exceedingly conservative, not at all radical, and not in the least bit improper.

Another thing I would say. If the matter should be barred entirely by stopping this, we are between two dangers, Scylla and Charybdis. On the one hand there are Bishops and there are clergymen who will authorize Lectionaries and changes anyhow. Then again, there are Bishops and there are clergymen who will change nothing. Now, better that we have a regular, lawful constitutional process, so carefully guarded that no man can go far wrong, and yet liberal enough to discountenance every infraction of law, than to stand stock-still, and do nothing, and bring in danger to that which now exists.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman a question? I do not clearly understand his proposition. Does he mean that this Lectionary, as proposed, is to be submitted to the Dio-

ceses, with the privilege of the parochial clergy to use it in the *interim*?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. No, sir.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. That is what I wanted to know. Then, do you mean that we are to arrive at this conclusion by constitutional amendment, instead of going to the Prayer-Book?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. What we mean is this: That if this constitutional amendment is proposed to the Dioceses, and the Dioceses consent to it, and show their consent by the vote of the next General Convention, then the next General Convention will be free to adopt this Lectionary proposed to them or any other.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. By a change in the Constitution?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. No, sir; this change of the Constitution will bring the control of the Lectionary within the power of a constitutional majority of both Houses.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. By Canon, then?

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. Certainly.

Rev. Mr. GIRAULT, of Louisiana. That seems to me to be irregular.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. If we do not do this we lose the Lent Lectionary.

Rev. Dr. FULTON, of Alabama. We lose the Lent Lectionary for the next three years, and every Canon for six years to come.

Rev. Dr. SMEDS, of North Carolina. I have but a word to say. I have great respect for the opinion of gentlemen who are opposed to this measure upon constitutional grounds, and I want to hear from them their reasons. I am in favor of this as at present advised, and at the same time I shall vote with great reluctance against their convictions, and I should like to hear from them why they are opposed to it.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. For one, I am very strongly opposed to it on the ground that it is bringing a change into the Prayer-Book by a side-wind. Is the Lectionary, or is it not, a part of the Prayer-Book to-day? If it be, we can only change it by a certain process provided in the Constitution. If it be not, we can change it by a momentary vote. If this is done, I should like to know what is to prevent our ruling out the Ordinal. Rule out the Ordinal by a change in the Constitution, and henceforth the Ordinal is to be considered a part of the Prayer-Book, and yet we can change it in a different way from the Prayer-Book.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The objection I have to it is this: the House of Bishops sent us down a message, in which they made a provisional arrangement to go into effect immediately. We came to the conclusion, as we must come, that such an arrangement was unconstitutional. We then adopted, upon the motion of the Clerical Deputy from New York, a Lectionary to go into force if approved, three years hence. We sent that to the House of Bishops with a Committee of Conference. They have met together and brought us back something entirely different, which we did not commit to them, and it seems to me to be a stretch upon the part of a Committee of Conference to bring back an entirely different proposition than those upon which the two Houses differed. That is one objection to it.

The other objection to it is that it does put the Lectionary of the Church within the control of a General Convention. It might come before them at the very last day, as in our case now, and they might upset entirely that Lectionary to which we have all become attached. If it was simply to give the General Convention the power to do this for one time, it might be very

different. I might be willing to leave it to the next General Convention, but I do not wish to make such a change in the Constitution as will place the Lectionary for all time to come under the control of any General Convention which may be, and which may unadvisedly, without deliberation, and in a thin House, upset entirely the Lectionary we have, and give us another altogether different.

But, if it were necessary, I think I could raise an appeal to gentlemen here, familiar with parliamentary law, whether this report can be received as the report of a Committee of Conference; whether a Committee of this kind can introduce, as a matter of conference, a thing which was not between the two Houses as a matter of difference when they were sent out to concur.

And if you will permit me one thing more, I do not think we ought to be forced into the adoption of a measure which we do not approve, simply because a Committee of Conference have introduced it, and we are told if we do not take this we shall get nothing. We can wait and send it back to another Committee of Conference, and see whether the House of Bishops and our House cannot agree on the only point of difference between us, which is, whether we should provide a Lectionary now tentatively, which we do not believe we have a right to do, or adopt one and let it lie for three years, and then adopt it as a law.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I wish to say that I signed that report simply because it was a report of what actually occurred. I still believe that my plan for reaching this matter is the only constitutional one, and the only proper one. The Bishops think that they have authority now to appoint a Lectionary to be used in Lent, and the only particular in which I would be willing to consent to this proposition is that it is tentative undoubtedly. We may hereafter find that there has been a selection of some one chapter which we would wish to change.

That may be the result of the experience we shall get through the actual use of the Lectionary. If that should be the case, it is true, I imagine, that we could not make that change without going through this whole process, which lasts three years. That is the only objection I see, and that is the only reason that will weigh with me to consent to this proposition. I close, as I began, by saying that I think my substitute for the resolutions which came to us from the House of Bishops is the only constitutional and proper way of reaching this matter.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. I regard this matter in this way, that it may happen that there may be one chapter, or two chapters, that may not commend themselves to the people generally. The body of the Lectionary may be right, and those minor amendments might be made at a future time. I think we are going upon dangerous ground to decide in this matter at this late hour, with the thin House we have, the delegations not full by any means, and arguing upon a measure to which we cannot give deliberate consideration.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. Mr. President, if I read our Book of Common Prayer aright, it contemplates that we shall have daily services in the Church, and the prescribed order for prayer is for Daily Morning and Evening Services. I submit that the lessons for the daily prayer morning and evening have been made without examination at all, or without that judgment which the Church requires to instruct its people. I have had my family in Church at times when lessons were read which I knew if intelligent examination had been given to them never would have been read. I have known members of this House who, when those lessons would come in the order of daily services, would never read them; and will this Convention stand here and refuse to give this

Convention power to change a Lectionary which the Presbyters, in violation of the Rubrics, daily disdain?

Mr. President, there is a crying evil here, and it is a subject so large, so complex, and of such details, that it is impossible to take hold of it in the form of a constitutional amendment. A constitutional amendment, you understand, is so rigid that whatever we adopt in this House must literally be adopted in the same words at the next Convention, not a syllable to be changed, not a variation to be made, and if a single word is changed in the constitutional amendment agreed to by this House at the next General Convention, it has to go over to the next Convention, and if the next Convention changes one word, it has to go to the next Convention, and the subject itself is of such a character that it is incapable of action through a constitutional amendment. I want to see the time come when we shall have daily services, and when it will be my privilege, as it is in other churches, to enter the house of God every morning, if you please, and there pray my morning prayer; and I want to see a Lectionary provided suitable for the occasion.

Nor are the Sunday Lessons without objection. The Sunday Lessons are divided by an arbitrary rule without intelligence or sense. As I have had occasion to remark, some of the most beautiful lessons are spoiled. When the subject-matter is appointed some other subject often happens to be in another part of the chapter which is wholly diverse, and the mind is thus taken off from the leading idea of the Lesson and the complete effect is lost.

Now what harm or what danger can there be in leaving to this Convention and the next Convention the action which is to take simply portions of the Scripture and prescribe them to be read? It is simply the selection of Scriptures for the lessons prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and I will say, if you pass this amendment and give the power to the next General Convention, it will be impossible for the next General Convention to frame a Lectionary. At the next General Convention, all they could do would be to raise an intelligent commission, which in the interval of three years can revise a subject so large as the collection which will embrace the whole Canonical Scriptures as well as Apocrypha, for they are all to be read, as our Rubric says, in the course of the year. If we give this power to the next Convention, I repeat, it can only be acted upon by the Convention afterwards upon the report of an intelligent commission which will give the subject detailed examination, by which alone justice will be done. I hope for the relief of all of us, who wish to hear proper lessons read, you will pass this constitutional amendment.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. Is this Lectionary proposed for all the days?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It is only for Lent; not for daily services.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman from Western New York will please give way for the reception of messages from the House of Bishops.

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 96), from the House of Bishops, announced that it had concurred in Message No. 97 from the House of Deputies, as to the printing of the Canon on Church Music in all editions of the Hymnal; in Message No. 98, as to the typographical changes in the revised Hymnal; Message No. 99, as to the use of the Morning Prayer, Litany, etc., independently.

CONGREGATIONS OF A FOREIGN RACE.

A message (No. 97) from the House of Bishops

announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution :

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That it is proposed to the several Dioceses to adopt the following additional article as an amendment, to wit:

"Article 11. Congregations of foreign races, or worshipping in a foreign tongue, may be admitted into communion with this Church, organized by ministers of the Church, under such provisions for the conduct of their public worship as may from time to time be canonically made by the General Convention."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move the reference of that to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments.

The PRESIDENT. It goes, then, without motion, unless objection be made.

SHORTENED FORMS OF PRAYER.

A message (No. 98) from the House of Bishops announced that it had concurred in Message No. 82 from the House of Deputies relating to the proposed amendment to Article 8 of the Constitution, with the exception of the last clause, to wit: the words "or may authorize the same to be done by any Diocese for its own use" (as to the General Convention providing by Canon for the arrangement and setting forth of shortened forms of services).

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that we concur in the action of the House of Bishops.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. It is a question for that House whether we shall recede.

The motion to concur was agreed to.

THE LECTONARY.

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I call for the reading of the Report of the Committee of Conference of the matter of the Lectionary. Some of us were engaged in signing testimonials, and did not know what it was.

The report was read.

The PRESIDENT. This report is before the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. An objection is made that this is an alteration of the Book of Common Prayer. With the great respect I have for the reverend gentleman from Massachusetts, I am surprised to hear such an argument from his intelligent mind. If I thoroughly apprehend that provision of the Constitution, it does not apply to the arrangement of the Lessons in their order for reading in the service, because the Book of Common Prayer, as regarded in a general sense, is a book of human composition, taken mainly from inspired sources, and the design of the constitutional amendment was, that we should not recognize any discretion of ours in changing that ancient form of words, which has come down to us, many portions of it, from the earliest ages.

But that principle, and the principle that you must ever keep sacred from alteration—the Text of the Book of Common Prayer—has no reference whatever, it seems to me, to altering chapters and divisions of the Scripture which shall be read in the Church. We do not want anything whatever to be altered but the order in which they shall be read, omitting, perhaps, portions of some chapters. The general Rubric on the subject of the Lectionary contemplates that some discretion is to be exercised on this subject, for it says they are arranged that the most of the Scriptures shall be read through in the course of the year, not the entire Scriptures. But the revision wants to be a little more carefully made. Is not the subject better divided than by the arbitrary divisions as now divided, and portions of it which are not adapted for general use omitted in the hearing of the congregation? I repeat that this does not con-

tradict the spirit of the Constitution which says that the Book of Common Prayer shall not be altered, and the mere general phrase, unless there be some particular application of the phrase, furnishes no argument to my mind.

If I understand the gentleman from Pittsburgh [Mr. Burgwin], he objects to this measure because it comes to us in some improper form, or because he sees some technical objection in the matter of form. I hope that a measure of this importance will never go off on a mere technicality. Let us look at the subject of it; and I ask, will this House allow the General Convention of this Church to revise and set forth a Lectionary for the use of the Church stripped of all technicalities? That is the simple question. Will they do it or not?

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I should like to call the attention of the Deputy from Western New York to the following Rubric, which has the same binding force as any Rubric within the covers of this book.

"And to know what Lessons shall be read every day, look for the day of the month in the Calendar following, and there ye shall find the chapters that shall be read for the Lessons, both at Morning and Evening Prayer."

I wish to say, and I call attention to this, and offer this proposition for a special purpose. The Italians have a proverb, "All roads lead to Rome," and I wish Deputies of this House to see how all roads lead to Rubrical revision.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. The gentleman will remember that the Calendar is changed by this House in the matter of the cycles continually of necessity, and this action only changes the Calendar—the Rubric is standing unaltered.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the Committee on Conference.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I suggest that we wait until we hear from the House of Bishops.

Mr. KING, of Long Island. Why shall we open the Constitution at this late hour of the session, when the House is not full?

Mr. DE ROSSETT, of North Carolina. I call for a vote by Orders.

Rev. Mr. BROWN, of Michigan. Will the Secretary call the vote on the report of the Committee of Conference?

The SECRETARY. I am waiting to be instructed whether to call by individuals or Dioceses? [Dioceses.]

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I think the individual names ought to be called in a matter of this importance.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the names. I think it important to make a remark before the House becomes further thinned, that the last vote by ballot showed that there were only twenty-six Dioceses represented in the lay vote. The lay members of the Convention ought not, therefore, unless they intend to dissolve this Convention by their own will, to leave the City without seeing that some member of the delegation remains and will remain. The roll will be called.

The Rev. Mr. BAKEWELL, of Kansas. Some of us want to understand the form of the question. Will the Secretary please read the report again?

The PRESIDENT. The report of the Conference Committee will be read.

The Secretary read the report and proceeded to call the roll.

During the taking of the vote, a message (No. 99) was received from the House of Bishops, announcing the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the following be proposed as an amendment

by way of addition to the 8th Article of the Constitution, to wit:

"Provided, however, That the General Convention shall have power from time to time to amend the Lectionary: but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of Bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and by a majority of all the Dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies."

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the House of Deputies cause the foregoing proposed amendment of the Constitution to be made known to the several Dioceses, according to the Constitution and Canons of this Church."

The call being concluded, the result was as follows:

CLERICAL VOTE: Forty Dioceses represented: ayes 31, noes 8, divided 1.

LAY VOTE: Twenty-six Dioceses represented: ayes 22, noes 3, divided 1.

The PRESIDENT. The report is agreed to by both Orders, and I suggest that the Secretary have leave to record this vote as being upon the motion for concurrence with the Message No. 99 of the House of Bishops. It will simplify the Journal. The Chair hears no objection to that course, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHEFFEY, of Virginia. I move that the Committee who had under its charge this matter of the Lectionary be continued till the next session of the General Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURGIN, of Pittsburgh. I suggest that the vote had better be taken on the concurrence with the House of Bishops, and then transfer the vote.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will direct that to be done, first putting the question on concurrence.

The message of the House of Bishops was concurred in.

STATE OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I think the House had better understand from the Secretary how much work remains before them.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amount of work.

The SECRETARY. It will be quite necessary that we have a quorum here to-morrow, there being, I think, nearly twenty important reports from the Committee on Canons to be acted upon either favorably or unfavorably, and undoubtedly there will be sent down from the House of Bishops some important action of their own.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for adjournment having arrived, the House stands adjourned until to-morrow morning at nine o'clock.



TWENTY-FOURTH DAY.

TUESDAY, November 3.

The Convention assembled in St. John's Chapel at nine A.M.

Morning Prayer was said to the end of the Psalter by Rev. William R. Huntington, D.D., of Massachusetts. The lessons were read by Rev. George D. Gillespie, of Michigan. The Creed and Prayers were said by Rev. A. Augustus Marple, of Central Pennsylvania. The Benediction was pronounced by the Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., Bishop of Albany.

The minutes of yesterday's proceedings were read and approved.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOP ADAMS.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that the Secretary be instructed to transmit to the House

of Bishops the testimonials of the Bishop-elect of New Mexico and Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

THE DAILY CHURCHMAN.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia, submitted the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Resolved, That the thanks of this House be tendered to Messrs. M. H. Mallory & Co., for their very excellent daily reports of the proceedings of this House; and that they be requested to make similar arrangements for reporting the next session of this body."

CHURCH MUSIC.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. In the Canon on the use of the Book of Common Prayer, it was provided for the division of the services so that at any time the Litany and the order for the administration of the Holy Communion as distinct services might be used independently of other services. The Canon on Church Music provides that before and after morning and evening prayer, or before and after the sermon, the songs, hymns, and anthems may be sung. It is thought by some, and especially by those who have a special interest in Church Music, that there should be added to that Canon words which would provide for the singing of Psalms or songs before and after the Litany, or before and after the administration of the Holy Communion, as these may at any time be separate services. I would, therefore, propose the following:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the Canon of Church Music be amended by adding immediately after the words 'Morning and Evening Prayer' these words, 'the Litany, or the Office of Holy Communion.'"

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Would that prevent the singing of a hymn during the Communion Service?

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Not at all; but it is intended to give this special permission, which some think does not exist now.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut. The Offertory should be included also.

Rev. Mr. DOUGLASS, of Delaware. This is very important. A practice is growing up in the Church in reference to the Offertory; but I have my doubts and misgivings about it, and I should like this amendment to have the sanction of a committee, before we act on it.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. The amendment strikes me as being a much graver suggestion than that contained in the resolution of my colleague from Massachusetts. And I hope the resolution will not be pressed in so thin a House. The presentation of alms being a distinctive Ritual act, any additional provision would seem properly to come under the head of Rubrical directions.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Perhaps I had better read the resolution again:

"Resolved, That the Canon of Church Music be amended by adding immediately after the words 'Morning and Evening Prayer' these words, 'the Litany, or the office of the Holy Communion.'"

The PRESIDENT. What is the object of that?

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. We have already passed a resolution whereby we permit the Lord's Supper to be administered separately by itself, and the Litany said by itself. This is merely to provide for singing before and after each, which we should do without a Canon, but had better do with it. The object is to secure permission to sing before the Litany and after the Litany, especially when that is used as a separate service. After this Canon was passed yesterday there was passed a resolution to this effect:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring),

That in the sense of this Convention nothing in the present order of the Book of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independent of each other, and either of them without the other."

If we use either of these services independently, we have no provision for singing in connection with them. It is proposed, then, to add these simple words, and say that whenever these services are used independently, and even when they are not used independently, a clergyman may feel authorized to give out psalms or hymns to be sung just preceding them or just following them, thus making a variety in the service, and dividing the different parts of the service one from the other. It is a very simple and harmless thing.

Mr. BARTHOLOW, of Kansas. I ask if this will add to or prolong the service?

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. It prolongs the service to the extent of so much singing.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I hope the Convention will not make the amendment. It seems to me to be doing by Canon what, if we have the power to do, really belongs to the Rubrics. I think custom gradually settles that matter, that they do it without raising that question. It is a Canon of common sense that does this. If you begin the service, then of course your Rubrics bind you. I think most clergymen are in the habit of considering that the service has not begun until they have actually started upon the Prayer-Book. I suppose that in a service beginning with the Litany, a hymn may come in by the Canon of common sense; but if you begin to act by Canon and begin to make a quasi Rubric by a Canon, you are on dangerous ground. I think if our brethren's consciences are troubled, we may regret it, and commend them to consideration in some other way. But the question which was raised with regard to the Offertory, I think, is pertinent. If you can, by a half canonical course, give a sort of Rubric at the beginning of the Litany, that here a hymn may be sung by Canon, though the Rubric says nothing of it, I do not know why you cannot then consider the question. That strikes me as quite unconstitutional to put in anywhere in the service permission to sing by Canon. In the offering of alms it is becoming the custom—a custom I do not quite fancy—to offer a chant or a hymn, or something. In the same way it has got to be the custom in a large number of congregations to chant an anthem during the Offertory. Custom probably will settle itself in the future and the Rubrics be modified in some way. But I do not think you can reach a difficulty of this kind by a Canon, and I think we had better let the matter stand as it is rather than open this question now. We have a very thin House—it is very late in the session—and I know that a great many clergymen have a good deal of feeling about the matter one way and the other. I think the thing would be far safer left as it is. If there be any evil, or doubt, or mistake, let us leave it at the present, and take it up at an early part of another session, and bring it in with the matter of Rubrical examination, which will probably come in due time; but I think it would be rather hasty legislation now, and certainly trench on a question that is a little dangerous. You cannot by Canon make something come in the service, you must do it by Rubric. Why undertake to say there may be a hymn at the beginning and the end? I think we have a right to do that anyhow, without any Canon or any Rubric; but when you come to touch the Offertory, and say that anything may be done there, it seems to me then you are plainly

interfering with the Prayer-Book, and putting in something that was not there. Yesterday we were doubtful about the musical sign of a colon as not to be put in without the constitutional process, and I think we had better keep clear of this.

Mr. BARTHOLOW, of Kansas. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I would prefer to withdraw it rather than to have it laid on the table. I perceive the force of the remarks made by the Clerical Deputy from Long Island, but I supposed the Canon had already overridden the matter, and that the Canon in giving permission to sing before and after sermons had already introduced this practical Rubric that he speaks of. If that is not the case, I certainly do not wish to introduce any such Rubric in an improper way. I have presented the resolution at the request of various members of the Convention; not entirely on my own behalf.

The PRESIDENT. Is the resolution withdrawn?

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. No; I will let it be laid on the table if that is thought best. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DISSOLUTION OF PASTORAL CONNECTION.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I ask if the business under consideration yesterday with reference to the Canon about the dissolution of the connection between ministers and their parishes may not come up at this moment?

The PRESIDENT. Just as well as any other time.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Why not take up the Calendar in its order?

The PRESIDENT. The Canon referred to was made a special order. It is now before the House.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I would call the attention of the Convention to this Canon for a few moments. It is a matter that came before the Convention at the request of the Diocese of Massachusetts, and not at my request, and yet it is a matter in which I feel a very deep interest. My whole heart is in it, and I am anxious that something should be done. It is the Canon on the dissolution of a pastoral connection. The Committee on Canons have already reported some amendments to this Canon which are great improvements to it, I confess, and I should be very glad to see them passed, if nothing better can be done. But the proposition which I have to make is to strike out and repeal the first five sections of the Canon, thus taking away all its objectionable features. This Canon now is a union of two Canons which existed before 1859. One of them constitutes the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Sections of this Canon. To that I have no objection whatever. The other was another Canon on the same subject, though with a different title, "the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection," and that constitutes the first five sections of this Canon.

This last Canon is the objectionable one. It was passed substantially originally in the year 1804, to provide for the case of Dr. Ogden, between whom and Trinity parish, in Newark, there existed a difference, which it was thought could not be settled except by general Canon. It continued on the roll of Canons until 1859; and then when we were in Richmond—and all honor I say to old Virginia for this—when its air was about us, we came to the conclusion to repeal this Canon, and struck it out. For over twelve years we remained without it, and it appeared again in 1871.

Almost everybody here will say it is late in the session. It is late, indeed. We spent half a month nearly in doing justice to those who were elected to the Episcopate, or in endeavoring to do so. I ask you now to spend at least half an hour in en-

deavoring to do justice to the large body of Presbyters, for it is simply justice and fairness to them that we ask in proposing the repeal of these sections.

Brethren may say it is the last day of the session. I reply to them, This Canon was passed on the last day of the session of 1871, and not only was passed, but almost every word which was said in reference to it—indeed, everything except what took place in the Committee on Canons, was upon the last day of that session, if I am not mistaken. The original Canon seemed to be called for by a necessity in a case, as I said, occurring in New Jersey, in the year 1804. I know not what necessity demanded the re-enactment in 1871. It was buried in 1859. We thought it was buried beyond any resurrection, and that it would not appear again; but—to adapt to my wants a stanza of one of the old English ditties—

“When summer suns had ceased to shine,
And leaves began to fall,
John Barleycorn came up again,
And sore annoyed us all.”

There are good reasons for the repeal of these first five sections. I wish to give four or five of those reasons, and I will give them in almost as many words. You will notice that my opposition is to the principle of the Canon, not to the details. The first reason is, that that principle is opposed to the spirit and policy of the Church. Bishop White said concerning this Canon, after it was adopted in 1804:

“The Canon deserves the name of a necessary evil, and it is hoped it will prove to be but a temporary evil.”

And afterward he wrote:

“That there seems to be no reason like this stated in the Canon why there should be a severance of the pastoral relations. It should not take place except as the result of trial for alleged misconduct.”

The Church became so convinced that it was against the spirit and policy of the Church, that in 1808 there was added to one of the Canons—not to this portion, but to the other portion—these words:

“The Church designs not to express approbation of any laws which make the *status* of a minister dependent upon anything else than his own soundness in the faith, or good conduct.”

And then goes on to add that it is hoped soon all these measures would be repealed, a hope which I have shown you was realized in 1859. Now, let us not have a Canon unless there is a very absolute necessity which needs this constant apology and explanation of it. What apology or explanation ought to be given to a wrong principle, or a principle that is doubtful or uncertain? It is better to abolish the principle. It is only with reference to details that explanation ought to be admitted in our Canons.

The second objection which I have to make is that it adds another way of making easier the severance of the pastoral relation. It is easy enough now, too easy, far too easy. I recollect an anecdote which Bishop Whitehouse, of Illinois, used to tell with great humor, concerning the late Rev. Dr. Berrian, for a long time Rector of Trinity Church, how he came one morning into his study, and found him apparently a little annoyed. Dr. Berrian told him that he had been visited by a clergyman who was anxious to obtain a new situation, and wished him to recommend him to one. He then added, “I do not see, doctor, what clergymen mean by desiring constantly to make these changes. Why, I never thought of such a thing as resigning my parish.” [Laughter.] There are very few parishes like Trinity Church. There are very few parishes which are like old Etna, covered

with its vines and its richness from the very base to the top, and under which the giant of discontent slumbers and will slumber year after year without making any rolling or any noise whatever. Almost all our parishes are rather like Stromboli, constantly casting out their objectionable things, and frequently with these casting out their pastors.

But I put it to my brethren, if with that Canon, institution has not become almost a farce, if a foundation upon the hope of close and endearing ties of affection bound by years of prosperity and adversity has not become a vain thing when we learn from statistics lately that three years is the average of the continuance now of the relation between a pastor and his people. Only three years! Only the time of the itinerant ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church!

The third objection is that this Canon invites division, invites the changing of small difficulties into those of which there is no hope of settlement. You will mark the language of the first words of the Canon:

“In case of a controversy between any Rector or Assistant Minister of any church or parish, and vestry or congregation, which cannot be settled by themselves.”

It seems almost to put a premium upon the effort to make a controversy which rose in a simple thing; rose in a slight disagreement between some vestrymen and the rector; rose in some little rumor or some little scandal in the parish; rose in their being a few pews less at Easter let than there were at the preceding Easter, or in the failure of some contribution during the year, matters exceedingly trivial and unfit to touch this great point. I say these are the matters which, by means of this Canon, seem to be blown into great evils until they burn up all those chords which unite together the rector and his people.

The fourth objection is that the Canon of 1871 has worked badly, and upon this point the Clerical Deputy from Wisconsin will tell you how the late honored Bishop of that Diocese declared that he would never have any action, if he could prevent it, under this Canon, because it did work so badly. I have looked over almost all the cases of which I have heard, and I do not know of a single case in which any good seems to have come to any parish or to anybody else by this endeavor, unless it be the printers who have published large volumes of correspondence and arguments upon it.

The fifth point is that it is unnecessary. From 1859 to 1871, twelve years, we went on without this part of the Canon only with the closing part, which then existed as a Canon separate by itself, and the appeal in that case was to the Bishop, and the Bishop, by his personal endeavors, brought about a reconciliation, if possible, between the people and their minister; and if that was not possible, his separation took place. Action went on then far more peacefully, and with much better results in most of the Dioceses. There were exceptions in some places, exceptions where ministers had peculiar tempers or where vestries had especial obstinacy, but in most cases that Canon alone by itself operated better than the two Canons united together.

Now this Canon of 1871 is said to have been especially written and prepared for the Ritualists. By the Canon on Ritual passed by the Convention, we have these Ritualists, if I may adopt the figure of the Isthmian games, actually in chancery, and it is not necessary now that we should have this Canon, or any other, so as to strike them at greater disadvantage. Now, for any larger cause than introducing some new custom, or some particular color, or some slight Ritual into the service, for any misconduct, for any heresy, for any false

speaking, for any immorality of any kind, we have the Canon for the trial of ministers. The causes which come up under the Canon under discussion are far more trivial than most of the members of this House perhaps may be aware of. One of the most important of the trials, which have occurred under it, had no more foundation than this, that a church had been established as a Low Church—I use the terms now that were used in the trial—and the minister who had been settled proved to be rather a High Churchman—not a High Churchman even according to the old-fashioned High Church standard, but “a rather High Churchman,” and the people were not satisfied that their Church should be carried on in any different way from that on which it was started; they must have it upon the foundation on which they built it. In addition to that, there was alleged that the congregation had fallen off, and that the collections had somewhat fallen off. Both of these small points proved upon the trial to be unfounded.

The sixth reason for desiring the repeal of this portion of the Canon is that while it stands it is a hindrance to entrance to the ministry, and such a hindrance as ought not to be interposed. There are few men who will desire to enter a ministry in which the relations between pastor and people are not founded upon such principles that they can carry out independently their own consciences, and labor as for the Lord Jesus Christ himself, without danger of being constantly stopped or driven from their parishes. What is the condition of matters now, and what has it been for the last six years? About seventy added to the ministry in each year.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move that the first five sections of this Canon be repealed.

Rev. Dr. WESTON, of North Carolina. May I be allowed but a moment or so, not to debate the question, for I do not think we have time for that, but to call the attention of the Convention to two facts. In the first place, these are two Canons combined, as the Deputy from Massachusetts remarked, but their original object was different. One was for the dissolution simply of pastoral connection; the other, for the adjustment of differences between ministers and their congregations. That is the reason why there are two Canons combined. They have two separate objects.

But in the second place, I should like the Convention to observe, that by the Canon as proposed no Diocese is bound to be under this legislation. It is left to each Diocese to adopt its own legislation on this subject if it chooses. This merely provides something to put into the chasm if there be no Diocesan legislation on the subject. I understand the Deputy as approving all our amendments as far as they go. The simple question is, whether we shall have any legislation or not. I am told by a Deputy from another Diocese that when the repeal of this first part was made some years ago, immediate cause arose in that Diocese for the enactment of a Canon of their own.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. That was one point I intended to make: why not leave it to the Dioceses?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. When we repealed that Canon, as the gentleman says, the very moment it was repealed we found that we were obliged, in the Diocese of Georgia, to frame such a Canon; and why? Simply for the sake of peace. Within the past year, but for that Canon we should have had to have an ecclesiastical trial. That Canon saved the necessity of it.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. Have you not a different Canon in Georgia from that?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. Yes, we have our own Canon.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Then you do not want this?

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I have no objection if you will let us have our own Canon. I only say we found the absolute necessity of such a Canon, for the sake of the peace of the Diocese. We have saved through this Canon ecclesiastical trials. Gentlemen may see larger difficulties than I do, and may see the absolute necessity of repealing the present Canon; but all I say is, that in my own Diocese there is a necessity for some Canon, for the sake of the peace of the Church, and to prevent ecclesiastical trials. Several times within the period since this Canon was passed, a simple statement that there was a Canon on the subject has saved a trial. As to there being anything frivolous in these troubles as to clergymen, we have nothing of the sort in the Diocese of Georgia. We have simply used it in cases where ecclesiastical trials would have been a necessity, and this Canon enabled the matter to be adjusted satisfactorily to all parties, and saved clergymen absolutely to the Church.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I want to say a few words in regard to this Canon that is now upon our Digest, Canon 4, of 1871, and I want to say it in the interest of my order. I will preface my remarks with the declaration that my deceased Bishop, Bishop Armitage, declared that this Canon was so eminently unfair that he would not use it in any shape or form. Let any Presbyter of this Convention go over this Canon, and he will see that the position of the trial is such that it can be made an instrument of tyranny over the Clergy of the Church in any Diocese by the very shape in which it is put, by the exceeding narrowness of the men who are judges, as we may call them, or jury. Any clergyman of the Church may be got, as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts said, into chancery—not the chancery of the law, but the chancery of boxers, in which a man's head is under another man's arm, and his head is mashed to pieces. That is the chancery in which the Presbyter of the Church may be put by this Canon, as any man who will honestly look over it and see the way in which the jury is organized must admit.

I have examined the Canon thoroughly. I have given the opinion of Bishop Armitage on the point. He desired to introduce the old Canon of 1832 in its stead. That old Canon of 1832 provides that the Bishop shall summon all the clergy of the Diocese, and then that body—a grand jury, we may say—as many of them as answer, make up their minds on the facts of the difference, and give a determination, which determination shall be obeyed by the clergyman. I have sat upon a Court under the old Canon, and we did the thing well and honestly; we separated the connection between the man and his congregation, and then we gave him eighteen hundred dollars as a bonus, and he took his eighteen hundred dollars and left, and good was done.

Now, if I can introduce this resolution, I will introduce it: to restore the Canon of 1832, and upon that Canon of 1832, I will say that Dr. Hoffman, in his Manual on Canon Law, which Manual was used on that trial, distinctly declares that it was Bishop White's opinion that, while the connection between a clergyman and his parish was indissoluble, nevertheless separation was a necessary evil which could not be avoided under certain circumstances; and this Canon 34, of 1832, was the best we could do under the circumstances of the case.

We are nearly at the end of the session, but I think this thing ought to come up. I think the clergy ought to understand their own interests sufficiently not to allow the Canon of 1871 to remain,

and I hope the next Convention will have the opportunity of laying out the thing as it ought to be laid out. My resolution is:

"Resolved, That Canon 4, Title II., of 1871, be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to report the old Canon 34, of 1832 for adoption instead."

I think that will settle the matter.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. I ask if Dr. Adams has that Canon and will read it?

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. The Secretary has a good deal better voice for this House than I have, and I ask him to read it.

The SECRETARY read Canon 34, of 1832, as follows:

"In cases of controversy between ministers who now, or may hereafter, hold the rectorship of churches or parishes, and the vestry or congregation of such churches or parishes, which controversies are of such a nature as cannot be settled by themselves, the parties, or either of them, shall make application to the Bishop of the Diocese, or, in case there be no Bishop, to the Convention of the same. And if it appears to the Bishop and a majority of the Presbyters, convened after a summons of the whole belonging to the Diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, to the Convention or the Standing Committee of the Diocese (if the authority should be committed to them by the Convention), that the controversy has proceeded to such lengths as to preclude all hope of its favorable termination, and that a dissolution of the connection which exists between them is indispensably necessary to restore the peace and promote the prosperity of the Church, the Bishop and his said Presbyters, or if there be no Bishop, the Convention or the Standing Committee of the Diocese, if the authority should be committed to them by the Convention, shall recommend to such ministers to relinquish their titles to their rectorship on such conditions as may appear reasonable and proper to the Bishop and his said Presbyters; or, if there be no Bishop, to the Convention or the Standing Committee of the Diocese, if the authority should be committed to them by the Convention, with the aid and consent of a Bishop, may, at their discretion, proceed, according to the Canons of the Church, to suspend the former from the exercise of any ministerial duties within the Diocese, and prohibit the latter from a seat in the Convention until they retract such refusal, and submit to the terms of the recommendation; and any minister so suspended shall not be permitted, during his suspension, to exercise any ministerial duties. This Canon shall apply also to the cases of assistant ministers and their congregations."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Let me say that we tried that Canon in North Carolina some twenty years ago, and found it worked with so much inconvenience that we came very clearly to the determination never to try it again.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I would like to call the notice of the members of the House to the fact that under the Canon as it now stands, and much more under the Canon if amended as the Committee on Canons propose it should be, it is in the power of a factious and troublesome and very small minority in a parish at the beginning to inflict the very greatest injustice upon a clergyman. It may be possible that a rumor originating with only one or two persons touching a man's soundness in the faith or touching his own personal moral character, may be fanned to such an extent, to such

size, that it shall create serious and great trouble in the parish; and by this Canon, instead of the clergyman having the guarantee of his own reputation, which is afforded by a full trial, with all the safeguards thrown around the trial by our Canons as they stand, he is placed at the mercy of a hastily appointed Commission which has none of the powers or limitations with regard to the taking of testimony which are prescribed in the Canon with regard to an ecclesiastical trial; and upon the decision of that Commission, hastily appointed and without any of those guarantees or limitations that I have spoken of, he may be compelled either to abandon his rectorship or be silenced in the Diocese; and if the amendment is adopted it is in the power of those opposed to him to press the matter still further and compel him to resign, or if he be unwilling to resign take from him even the civil rights that belong to his rectorship. It places him, therefore, actually in the power of mischief-makers, and it takes away, as I said, the guarantees which are given to his personal rights in every court. It makes the Canon for the trial of clergymen almost a nullity.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON, of Connecticut. It seems to me that a more serious objection than has yet been mentioned goes to the Canon as it now stands, and to the Canon of 1832, which it is proposed to adopt in its place, namely, that this court, if we may call it such, is not by the letter of the Canon permitted to enter into the question of the right or wrong at issue between any rector or assistant minister and the parish, but it is confined to the simple question whether or not a dissolution of the connection between the rector or assistant minister, and his parish or congregation, is necessary to restore the peace of the Church and promote its prosperity. It is very easy to conceive of parishes utterly in the wrong on the question at issue between them and their rector, where the peace and prosperity of that parish do require the dissolution of the relation between them and their Rector, and, therefore, I claim that by the very letter of this Canon, even though the parish is in the wrong, and the Rector is in the right, simply because this Court can take into consideration nothing, except what is likely to conduce to the peace and prosperity of that parish, they must decide against the right, and in favor of the wrong. In other words, it is adopting in this Church that heathenish principle of policy and self-interest, instead of the Christian rule of right and justice. Precisely the same motive that led the early Church because its members were tired of persecution and were longing for prosperity to admit into its councils and to a seat at its head Constantine, an unbaptized heathen; and that act, which was performed in accordance with policy rather than in accordance with right and justice, has been a curse to the Church from that day to this. I say if we are to have any Canon whatever on this subject, I hope it will be one permitting a trial according to right and justice, and not according to policy.

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Michigan. It is so late in the session that I hope the amendment proposed by the Deputy from Wisconsin may go to the Committee on Canons. I certainly would be among the first to reject from our Code almost any Canon that would lead to a dissolution of pastoral connection, for I believe if there is any great evil under which this Church especially labors at present, it is the brevity of the pastoral connection. I know in one Diocese we celebrated the fact that one clergyman had been twenty-five years in a parish, which was something so extraordinary that his brethren came to congratulate him on the fact. But, sir, occasions will arise where, I

think, some Canon would be rather promotive of peace than otherwise. There are sometimes differences between clergymen and their congregations which cannot be settled by the parties, where, very much to the advantage of both, some power from outside may step in to arrange the difficulty. I have before my mind such a case. It is very true we may have Diocesan Canons for such cases, but still a general Canon comes with more majesty, and has more respect.

I do not suppose this House in its last hours will go very fully into the subject, but I hope the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin may receive the attention of the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. BROWN, of Albany. Mr. President, I am opposed to this Canon; and yet it seems to me the safer way, at this late day of the session, would be to adopt the amendments of the Committee, which have been carefully thought out, and then remit the subject, if we can, to their further consideration, and at the next session of the General Convention sweep it away for ever.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. The amendments of the Committee do not touch the first section, and the first section is the worst in the whole Canon, and if gentlemen will only try their hands at a little ecclesiastical ciphering, they will see exactly what it means. The rector is to nominate three Presbyters, and the vestry are to nominate three Presbyters, and the Bishop nominates three Presbyters. If we look, first of all, at the penalties, we shall see that the congregation or the vestry risk the loss of nothing which they care for. As a general rule, our laity are not so anxious to attend the Diocesan Convention as to feel it a great deprivation to be suspended from the privilege: our difficulty is to get them to attend; and yet that is all that they risk the loss of. But the clergyman, if he does not accept this result, is to be suspended from all exercise of ministerial function in the Diocese until he submits and gives up his rights. That is not fair.

The same unfairness runs throughout. Either party, we are told, may appeal to the Bishops. That looks very fair, but it is about as fair as the old alternation between the white man and the Indian in regard to dividing their spoil. They had a buzzard and a turkey, and the white man said to the Indian: "I will take the turkey and you take the buzzard; or you may take the buzzard and I will take the turkey." That is the only alternative that is given. Who is likely to appeal to the Bishop in case of a rectorial difficulty? Is the Rector likely to call in the Bishop? By no means. He does not need any Bishop's aid to stay where he is, and that is all he wants. It is only the vestry that are likely to appeal, and the vestry are never likely to appeal excepting when they know that they are likely to have the sympathy of the Bishop; and when they risk nothing, whether they succeed in the appeal or whether they do not.

When these nine are nominated—three by the rector, three by the vestry, and three by the Bishop—then comes the ciphering. Each of the two parties to the contest has a right to knock off, one at a time, until the number is reduced to five. Of course, the vestry will knock off one of the rector's friends, and the rector will strike off one of the vestry's friends; and so the operation is done a second time, until at the end the five are constituted.

Thus there will be the three Bishop's Presbyters, one of the vestry's Presbyters, and one Presbyter representing the poor rector. So the Board is four against the rector—four to one to begin with—or, if the rector does not nominate three friends, the Bishop is to nominate for him, and then the Board will be five to none against the rector at the be-

ginning. Then if he does not accept the sentence of that Board, he is suspended from all exercise of the ministry in that Diocese until he resigns his rights. It is a simple guillotine put into the hands of the Bishop to cut off the head of any rector who may happen to be in a temporary difficulty with his vestry, and that without giving a chance to go over another Easter, and see whether the majority of the congregation will not stand by the rector and put his friends in command of the vestry.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. Mr. President, I have had the necessity of witnessing some very serious experiences under this Canon; but, before I give you any of them, let me suggest to you that it is possible, under the old Canon, or under the new one as proposed, for any parish in the world to get rid of its rector, no matter what he does. It becomes a question, at last, of merely whether it is for the peace of the Church. Any two men, or two women, may get up such a clamor, kick up such a dust, to use a slang phrase, in three weeks, that it becomes perfectly evident to every body that it is for the peace of the Church that the relation should be dissolved, regardless of the right or the wrong. I have known a single instance of that kind, where the original examination having failed technically at the next Convention of that Diocese, a gentleman came in and moved this resolution:

"Resolved, That, be the clergyman right or wrong, it is his duty to go away."

Had it not been a case where there was an error that the vestry concluded, on the whole, not to avail themselves of in the end, that man would have been compelled to go away. The circumstances were substantially these: A gentleman between fifty and sixty years old, who had been his whole life in the Church, who had built in one Diocese three churches, and partly with his own hands, who had built three rectories for his own residence, one of them entirely with his own hands, who had done as good work as any man in that Diocese, at last became obnoxious to two or three women. Through them and their husbands a trouble was created in the vestry and in their Church, and this Canon was brought into requisition. The man was summoned to meet the triers some two hundred or three hundred miles away, as he had to go from where he lived, and he was then carried, by the way he had to go, one hundred and forty miles further. There was an intervention of the Standing Committee on the matter, and his rights were saved on the ground that he could not be there; that there was no body of men that ever tried another so far away from his own vicinage; that the venue was wrong. The Standing Committee advised a settlement; the minister was ready to accept it, but the vestry took umbrage. They had been thwarted. The man was left in the parish, and they said, "We will do nothing." Well, that saved his rights. They owed him eight hundred dollars according to their own admission, five hundred dollars of which was money advanced in one building and three hundred dollars in another; but they insisted that that man should be thrust out of their parish, when he had built their church, came to New York and raised one thousand five hundred dollars to furnish it, and had done as good labor there as ever a man did: they insisted that he should be thrust out of that parish regardless of what they owed him and regardless of all right, and they have driven him to support himself by his own hands, and to-day he is insane.

I do not believe that the Canons of the Church ought to furnish material for the insane asylums, and I do not believe that there ever was a Canon that could be brought with such pressure to bear upon a clergyman since the Church had its beginning as the Canon under which we have been work-

EUCCHARISTIC ADORATION.

ing for three years; and although the one proposed by the Committee is better, it is all wrong. There should be no bid towards trouble, and this is a bid towards trouble. Let me be a layman, and if I fall out with my clergyman, no matter how right he may be or how wrong I may be, I can make it evident to any committee on the face of the earth in three weeks' time, being an active man and working in my parish among both sexes, among the old and the young, that he should leave, and the Canon will send him away, and it will send him away often regardless of the right. I have seen one man, the best working man I ever saw in my life, set crazy by this process, and I hope never to see another. The old Canon brought up by Dr. Adams is very good, and I would prefer to go back to that.

Rev. Mr. McILWAIN, of Iowa. I am disposed to think, if we let this Canon remain as it is, it will do no harm, because these difficulties can easily be settled by a man leaving his place, and if he is worth much he can easily get a good place. Now, if there be so many objections to this Canon as gentlemen urge, we certainly have no time to consider them. If there be found in it good points, as some gentlemen think, we can certainly live under the Canon for three years longer. I therefore move that the whole subject be laid on the table.

Rev. Mr. ROGERS, of Texas. That leaves the old Canon with that pressure upon us. The new Canon is infinitely better.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The motion was not agreed to.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I should like to have the question taken on the repeal of the first five sections, and I wish to know what to do with my amendment. I propose to move that amendment in case these abominable sections are not repealed.

The PRESIDENT. You can withdraw your amendment for the present.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I withdraw my amendment for the present, but I hope the clergy and laity of this Church will repeal these five sections so as to relieve us from this burden now.

The PRESIDENT. The motion of Dr. Burgess, as I understand it, is to amend the report of the Committee by striking out all after the word "Resolved," and inserting "that the first five sections of the Canon of 1871 be repealed."

Mr. COFFIN, of Pennsylvania. The delegation from Pennsylvania call for a vote by Dioceses and Orders.

The PRESIDENT. Will not the gentleman allow the vote to be taken *viva voce*? Does the gentleman insist on the call for Dioceses and Orders?

Mr. COFFIN, of Pennsylvania. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. Then I hope the whole matter will be laid upon the table.

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. I move to lay the whole matter on the table. There is not a large portion of the House present at this time, and I do not think we ought to legislate on such important questions with such a thin House. I understand from the Secretary that there are fifteen or twenty matters on the Calendar to be acted on. I think they ought to be gone through with, such as can be readily disposed of. I move, therefore, that this be laid upon the table.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. Allow it to drop without any action, or to remain as it is until the next Convention. I move that this subject be postponed until the next Convention, if the House prefers.

Mr. CASS, of Pittsburgh. Very well; I withdraw my motion.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move to postpone it until the next General Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Let us go on with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT. The Calendar is in order, and the Secretary will state the first business upon it.

The SECRETARY. The first business on the Calendar is the resolutions offered by the Rev. Mr. Jennings respecting Eucharistical Adoration.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. Forasmuch as the House has already acted by its votes on the Rubrical Commission proposition in such a way as to indicate its wishes, I desire to withdraw the second and third resolutions.

The PRESIDENT. Shall leave be granted to withdraw the second and third resolutions?

Leave was granted.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I now beg permission to offer the following substitute for the first resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the following are hereby solemnly declared to be foreign to this Church, to wit:

"1. Such rites, ceremonies, and usages of Eucharistic adoration as proceed from the belief that Our Lord is present upon the Holy Table as the appointed place of His presence in and under the forms of bread and wine, by virtue of the consecration of the elements, and is therein to be worshipped; and that He is offered by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

"2. All teachings leading to the rites, ceremonies, and usages aforesaid."

If I did not believe that this is the general sentiment, when we come to get at it, of this body, I would not take your time; but I scarcely can allow myself to believe that it will lead to very extensive discussion. We stand in a questionable attitude before the American people. The American people, I will not say distrust us, but they do stand in doubt, painfully to themselves, damagingly to us, because there are Romish usages symbolizing the existence in the Church of Romish doctrines. This American people will never consent that any of the Protestant Communion shall lead them to the Vatican; this American people will never consent to throw themselves into the embrace of the old man of the Tiber; and we owe it, brethren, to our noble Church to put her in a proper position before the American people. We know where we stand; we know that these are not our rites, ceremonies, and usages; we know that the doctrines symbolized thereby are not the doctrines of this Church; but the people do not know it, and I tell you that one of the most formidable difficulties that the Presbyters of the Church have to meet in the West, South, and Southwest, in the propagation of the faith, is just this very thing that we find the people stand in doubt of us, as to our loyalty to the principles of the Reformation and of the fathers of the English Church.

I am credibly informed that in a city which shall be nameless, last Lent, a gentleman went into one of our churches, and there found three ministers almost choking up the doorway, kneeling upon the pavement in the presence of a picture—in silent devotion, viewing a picture of our Lord. After a while they wandered along on their knees to the presence of another picture—the seven stations of the cross, mind you. Astonished, this churchman went away, and went to another church in the same city; and lo! over the doors of that church he read, with still greater pain and astonishment, if possible, "Madame Jarley's Waxworks on exhibition for the benefit of the Church." [Laughter.] He came to this conclusion: "This is a broad Church; this is an all-comprehensive Church."

Now what I want is a simple declaration like this,

that will show, as we have already shown by our baptismal action, that we rule out Madame Jarley on the one side, that we exclude such exhibitions on the one side, and say, this Church will pronounce foreign to herself all exhibitions of the Scarlet Woman on the other.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move that five minutes more be granted.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. The matter has been a long time on the Calendar, and if the House is willing to say what our Protestant faith is, very well, and if the House regards its past action as sufficiently significant, I have nothing more to say.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. I move to lay the whole subject on the table.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I hope the House will not take this course. The resolution had better be withdrawn rather than laid on the table.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. Let us meet it squarely. If it is simply understood that the House decline to take action on this proposition because they consider their action upon the Rubrical commission upon baptismal regeneration, and upon the election of Bishop Seymour, sufficiently significant, I will submit.

The PRESIDENT. We cannot tell the motives. Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. If we were all to give our reasons, it would take a long time.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. May I not be allowed to refer the matter to the next Convention? [No, No.]

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Excuse me. I have some right. I have moved to lay this resolution on the table and I do not withdraw that motion. I insist upon my right to have the question taken.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I hope the proposition will be withdrawn. It involves an important doctrinal question; and how can you have an expression of opinion when there is not a full House here?

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. I discover from what is said that the feeling is that the House has already taken sufficiently significant action. Therefore I beg leave to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I move that leave be granted.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution was withdrawn.

PRAYER FOR AUTHORITIES.

The next business on the Calendar was the resolution offered by Mr. Cornwall, of Kentucky, relative to the Prayer for the President, etc.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I move that it be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT. Perhaps it would be better to refer it to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN. I submit the motion that it be referred to the next General Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

The next business on the Calendar was the resolution offered by Rev. Dr. Stringfellow, of Alabama, asking leave to withdraw certain papers in the keeping of the House.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN. The doctor is not here; but I will, in his name, withdraw the resolution.

The PRESIDENT. If no objection be made, the resolution will be considered as withdrawn.

CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

The next business on the Calendar was communications from the Lower House of Convocation of the

Province of Canterbury, England; and the Secretary of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of this House be instructed to convey to the Rev. Dr. Frazer and the Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation the grateful recognition of their courtesy in transmitting copies of their official proceedings, and that he also forward to the proper officer of the Convocation copies of our Journal and formal proceedings so far as may be in his power."

The resolution was agreed to.

SYNODS OF DIOCESES.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed Canon 'Authorizing the Formation of Synods of Dioceses.'"

The resolution was agreed to.

STATE OF THE CHURCH.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons.

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Sections 4 and 5, of Canon 15, of Title I, be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Convention of every Diocese, or of the person or persons with whom the Journals or other ecclesiastical papers are lodged, to forward to the House of Deputies at every General Convention, on or before the first Monday of the session, the documents and papers specified in this Canon.

"Sec. 5. It shall be the duty of the Bishop and Standing Committee of the Church in every Diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, of the Standing Committee only, to prepare, previously to the meeting of every General Convention, a condensed report and a tabular view of the state of the Church in their Diocese, comprising therein a summary of the statistics from the parochial reports, and from the Bishop's addresses, specifying the capital and proceeds of the Episcopal Fund, and of all Benevolent and Missionary associations of Churchmen within the Diocese, and present the same to the Secretary of the House of Deputies on or before the first Monday of the session, for the purpose of aiding the Committee on the State of the Church, appointed by the House of Deputies in drafting their reports."

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. This is a very important aid to the Committee on the state of the Church.

The resolution was agreed to.

CANON ON DIVORCE.

The next business on the Calendar was the report of the Committee on Canons, on Message No. 21 from the House of Bishops, containing an amended Canon on Divorce, which concluded with the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House of Deputies concur with the House of Bishops in the proposed Canon on the subject of Divorce, with the following amendments:

"1. Strike out Section I.

"2. Strike out Sections III., IV., and V.

"3. Strike out the words 'Section II.'

"So that the Canon may read as follows:

"Of Marriage and Divorce."

"No minister of this Church shall solemnize matrimony in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, and where the divorce was obtained for some cause arising after marriage; but this Canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the

cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again."

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The only change in the present Canon there is the introduction of the clause, "cause arising after marriage." The Committee thought it was inexpedient to introduce, at all events at this time, the penal arrangements which were provided in the Canon as sent from the House of Bishops. In order to understand the matter, perhaps Message No. 21 from the House of Bishops had better be read.

The SECRETARY read Message No. 21 from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The House will perceive that the changes proposed by the Committee on Canons on the action of the Bishops are these: In the first place, we leave out the first section proposed by them, "if any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word allows, their marriage shall not be lawful," simply on the ground of its being unnecessary. That is in the marriage service, and it is thought better not at present to burden the Canon by putting the paragraph in. Section 2, the Committee propose to adopt exactly as it comes down to us in the message of the Bishops. The amendment of the present Canon is that the divorce must be for cause existing previous to marriage. That amendment is made in the Canon as it stands in the Journal of 1871. That is all the change proposed in the second section, or in the existing Canon.

Then the third, fourth, and fifth sections of the Canon coming down from the House of Bishops, it is proposed to strike out entirely. These sections provide for inflicting penalties for violations of the Canon, and providing the machinery by which the facts of the case may be reached. We thought it inexpedient at this time to legislate on these subjects.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. Is there any provision made for restoration?

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. The new matter is the introduction of the words:

"And where the divorce was obtained for some cause arising after marriage."

The first was too sweeping, and this a qualification.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I think the difficulty with regard to the old Canon was that it gave no protection to us, the clergy of the Church, in these cases, and this Canon as it comes down from the House of Bishops gives us protection; that is to say, it says what we are to do in reference to such persons coming forward to Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. I think that the laity and clergy of this Church on examining the Bishops' Canon, will see that it is a right step in the divorce legislation of this Church. As to the reason for omitting the first clause of the Bishops' Canon because it cumbers us, I think that is a mistake. I think that every Christian man will see that the only proper basis of divorce is the judgment decreed by Christ Himself, and I am proud to say that in this great State of New York that still remains the basis of legislation, and in nineteen cases out of twenty when a divorce is sued for in this State it is what we call the minor divorce, that is to say, a judicial separation of the parties, instead of breaking the bond of union. I think, as I say, that the Bishops' Canon is the more appropriate; it protects us; it defines the matter more clearly; it takes the thing out of the vagueness which was the general understanding of the initial step that we took in 1868, and which was universally censured by every one who desired that this subject of matrimony and divorce should be put upon proper and suitable ground. I therefore would move as

an amendment that this House concur in the Canon that has come down from the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that this subject be referred to the next Convention. If we make a change in the Bishops' Canon, it will lead to debate there, and this is a difficult and delicate subject. I am as much opposed to the report of the Committee almost as I am to the Canon sent down by the Bishops; and I am perfectly certain that in a full Convention there would be a very exciting debate. I do not think we are at all prepared for it, and I do not think we can do more than refer it to the next General Convention.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. How will that affect the present Canon?

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. It will leave it just where it is.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved to refer the matter to the next General Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

POSTURES IN THE COMMUNION OFFICE.

The next business on the Calendar was the report of the Committee on Canons, on a resolution requesting the expression of their opinion as to postures in the Communion Service. The resolution of the Committee is as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed resolution in regard to postures in the Communion Service."

The SECRETARY. The following resolution was offered by Dr. Schenck, of Long Island, to be placed on the Calendar in this connection:

"Resolved, That this House re-enact the preamble and resolution passed at the session of the General Convention in 1829, viz.:

"Whereas, In the celebration of the Communion Office there is a variety of posture observed, and it is desirable that uniformity as far as practicable should be obtained in this respect. Therefore,

"Resolved, That this House do respectfully request of the House of Bishops the expression of their opinion as to the proper postures to be used in the said Office, with a view of effecting uniformity in that respect during the celebration."

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. The resolution never belonged to the Committee on Canons at all. It was introduced on the sixth day of the session, and in the remarks which I made on introducing it, I closed with the words:

"I only offer it now that it may take its place on the Calendar."

And the President said:

"The resolution will go on the Calendar."

How the Committee on Canons succeeded in getting hold of it after that, I am unaware. At any rate, they got it, sat on it, and incubated the resolution which has just been reported, the shell of which I shall be very happy to crack, if there is anything in it, because I do not think it ought to be before the House in that form. I introduced the resolution on the sixth day of the session, in order that early action might be had upon it, because I understood that many members of the House of Bishops wanted the resolution before them, but it was in the Committee on Canons during the long period we were discussing the Confirmation of Professor Seymour, and it was only after that that I began to look after it, and found it was not on the Calendar. So after a ramified search I succeeded in unearthing it and got it placed on the Calendar, and that is the way it is before us now. I beg therefore to suggest that the report of the Committee on Canons is a mistake, and is not in order, and ought not to receive any action from this House; but that we ought to consider the resolution simply upon its merits. I am very well aware that if I were to

press the resolution now I should be answered by the trite complaint of the thinness of the House. I beg to say that there is no such complaint as that on the part of the Deputies from Long Island.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. As far as I know, the Committee on Canons are willing to withdraw their report.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I would like to submit this resolution for passage. It is a very simple thing, and I know that the House of Bishops have been looking for it for some time, and I know that it will be very gratefully received there. I do not propose to discuss it. It is simply to re-enact a resolution which was passed in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, at the General Convention of 1829. The resolution I now offer is precisely in the words of the resolution of 1829, and the House of Bishops received that resolution and acted upon it, and in the General Convention of 1832 they set forth and expressed the unanimous opinion of the House of Bishops touching the proper postures in the Communion service. We know very well that the most of those postures are regulated by Rubric. It is only proposed that the Bishops would express their opinion where the Rubrics are vague and uncertain, or where they give no special direction.

The opinion, as set forth then, has been, as a general thing, complied with, and the consequence is that there has been a general use of the Church, until within the last few years; and now that we have passed the Canon on Ritual, which is designed, like the Public Worship regulation bill, passed in England lately, to facilitate proceedings, touching the irregular practices, it seems to me important, that as supplementary to that action there should be a reassertion of the aggregate or unanimous opinion of the House of Bishops touching the proper postures to be observed in the Communion Office, that Bishops having cases brought before them for their consideration, can be guided, if not governed in their action by such opinion as may be set forth by the House of Bishops, so that we may have adjudications under a common use throughout the whole country. Otherwise we may find complaint made in one Diocese touching postures assumed in the Communion Office that may be adjudicated in one way, and in another Diocese in another way, which will make a conflict of decision that is certainly very undesirable.

To those who, if it be possible that there are any such in the General Convention, may not have looked beneath the surface of this thing, I would simply say that the very essence of the action taken by this body is in regard to Eucharistic adoration; and we know very well that the time that is offered is after the consecration of the elements; and we know that in 1832 the Bishops unanimously set forth that the proper posture of the singing of the hymn, and the *Gloria in Excelsis* was the standing posture for the priest and people; and we know that has been forgotten or ignored, and that therefore that very question of posture as indicating the adoration is the question of the most importance to be adjudicated.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I want to make a motion in regard to this resolution of the Reverend Doctor from Long Island; but I should like, in the first place, to say that I think he has quite misunderstood the purport of our action in this House in the Ritual Canon, as I think I can show.

The Ritual Canon presents four different kinds of Ritual acts. First, bowing; second, genuflections; third, kneeling; and fourth, prostrations. It approves of one of these—kneelings; it forbids three of them—bowings, genuflections, and prostrations. Now, it is very evident that bowing and

genuflections are not as reverential as kneeling; and prostrations may be said to be excessive kneeling. Now, I take it that that Canon forbade prostrations in the interest of forbidding transubstantiation, and it forbade bowings and genuflections in the interest of forbidding things less than that which kneeling typifies. Kneeling typifies the doctrine of the real presence. I take it, therefore, that bowings and genuflections probably typify Zwinglianism and Calvinism, and, therefore, that these three things are aimed at. I do not believe that the difficulties which the Reverend Doctor speaks of are ever going to be met by anything issued by the House of Bishops on this subject. There are difficulties, but they will be settled by and by. I, therefore, move that the resolution of the reverend gentleman from Long Island be laid upon the table.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I hope the same respectful consideration which has been given to other matters will rather cause its postponement to the next Convention.

The PRESIDENT. The resolution can be introduced at any time when the Convention meets.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. That would be a more graceful go-by.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOSING SERVICES IN CALVARY CHURCH.

A message (No. 100) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it had adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That the Pastoral Letter be read in Calvary Church this Tuesday evening at half-past seven o'clock."

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. The House of Bishops propose that the closing services to-night be held in Calvary Church. I will state why. They say, on election day, this is a part of the city that they would not like to invite people to at night. If notice be given now, it can be in the afternoon papers. On behalf of the Committee on Closing Services, I move that the message of the House of Bishops be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

CLERGYMEN CHARGEABLE WITH MISDEMEANOR.

A message (No. 101) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in Message No. 96 from the House of Deputies, concerning amendments of Section 1 of Canon 3 of Title II. of the Digest.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

A message (No. 102) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it concurred in Message No. 104 from the House of Deputies, continuing the Joint Committee on the Lectionary; and in Message No. 102 from the House of Deputies, enlarging the Joint Committee on the Spanish Prayer-Book.

INFORMATION ASKED.

A message (No. 103) from the House of Bishops informed the House of Deputies that it had adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House respectfully asks the House of Deputies for information whether it has taken any action on the subject of Message No. 21 from the House of Bishops communicating a Canon of Divorce, or of Message No. 27 from the House of Bishops communicating an addition to Canon 19 of Title I., as to Pastoral teaching concerning family worship, light and vain amusements, and, if so, what in the respective cases."

SYNODS OF DIOCESES.

The next business on the Calendar was the follow-

ing resolution, submitted by Rev. Dr. Kidney, of Minnesota:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a joint commission, to consist of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen, be appointed to report to the next General Convention a Canon, or a constitutional amendment, or whatever legislation may be necessary, to authorize the formation of Synods of Dioceses, or some kind of ecclesiastical union of Dioceses, within the same State or Commonwealth."

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. I do not propose to say anything, Mr. President, upon the merits of this question, but I observe that the matter of the provincial system was debated on the day before yesterday, during my absence. Had I been here, I should have desired to obtain the floor to say something upon it. I hope, however, that the House will allow this measure to pass, namely, the appointment of a Joint Commission to take under consideration the subject named in the resolution. It will relieve a want which is felt by every Diocese which has divided or which proposes to divide. Some may think that the existing Canon allowing the federation of Dioceses is all-sufficient, but it does not meet all the wants of those who desire this thing. To say no more about it, I will mention one or two deficiencies in it. In the first place, there is no provision made by that Canon for unanimity or uniformity of action in this particular. Every federation of Dioceses under that Canon may be different from any other federation. There is no similarity. It is best therefore, I contend, that this House should determine what are to be the powers of any such synodical body which may be formed, rather than that, according to the terms of the existing Canon, they shall present the powers to the General Convention which they propose to exercise.

More than that, it is a desired thing that when Dioceses propose to divide, they shall be able to retain a symbol of their union before such division has actually been accomplished; in other words, that they may still be one as a Synod before division takes place. It is well that such a commission should take into consideration the propriety of appending such a clause to any Canon or other document which may be thought necessary.

Unless this is done, we shall have schemes originating in individual minds, and I contend that it is better that there should be a commission composed of thoughtful men who shall supplement each other's thoughts, and who will be able to mature a better scheme than is likely to originate in any one individual mind. It is a want that is felt; it is a relief that is desired to be granted. In some shape or other, it will come up before every Convention that meets hereafter. It is proposed that we shall now take the initiative, and obtain, if possible, a commission of wise men who shall deliberate upon this matter together, and mature some scheme which sooner or later will meet with our assent.

I say nothing more whatsoever upon the merits of this question, but simply express my hopes that the House will allow the appointment of a Joint Commission, to consist of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three laymen who probably ought to be selected from the Dioceses at the East, that they can readily meet together without trouble or great expense, who shall take up this matter and endeavor, if possible, to relieve the wants which have been felt or expressed. Then we shall have some scheme matured worthy of our consideration rather than that schemes less carefully matured shall be brought up by individuals to be rejected.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I second the motion. I am very willing to have such a commission,

and to have them exhaust all their efforts to produce something that will work. What we have now certainly does not work. If they can make anything that will work without doing harm, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. This subject has been before the General Convention, more or less, since the year 1862, but it has never had the advantage of being before any General Convention in such a matured shape as to give it any fair chance of decent consideration. It has been left to individuals to bring in their schemes now at one time and now at another. The very magnitude of the subject has swamped it in the Committee on Canons; and when it has been brought up it has been in so imperfect a shape, in such a puzzled way, and so late in the session that it has amounted to little or nothing. The very magnitude of the question is so great that all the thought and all the care that can be given by a joint commission during the recess of the General Convention is none too much to give to a thing which we must have sooner or later, and the sooner we get it in a well-matured shape the better.

Mr. MEIGS, of New Jersey. Only one word. When the diocese of New Jersey determined to divide there was a general expression in the Convention of regret that there should be a division where there had been so much harmony and so much unity; and in order to avoid it a plan was proposed somewhat similar to this suggested synod, that is to say, that there should be an organization which should keep the two Dioceses somewhat together under some such plan, and it was advocated very earnestly by a great many of our people, and among the rest by myself. I regret very much that it was lost by a small majority. But there is no doubt in my mind that something of this kind would promote harmony and unity in the Church more than anything else we can accomplish. I trust therefore the resolution will pass.

The resolution was agreed to, and the President appointed as the Joint Committee on Synods of Dioceses, on the part of the House of Deputies, Rev. Dr. Cady, of New York, Rev. Dr. Kidney, of Minnesota, Rev. Dr. Pare, of Central Pennsylvania, Mr. Forsyth, of Albany, Mr. Meigs, of New Jersey, and Mr. Redfield, of Vermont.

ABANDONMENT OF COMMUNION.

The House next proceeded to consider the report of the Committee on Canons upon Message No. 29 from the House of Bishops, proposing an amended Canon "Of the Abandonment of Communion of this Church by a Bishop."

The Committee reported the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in their proposed amendment to Canon 8, Title II., with the following amendments:

"1. Insert after the word 'Church,' in the fourth line of the amended Canon, these words, 'either by an open renunciation of the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the Church, or by a formal admission into any religious body not in communion with the same or otherwise.'

"2. In the thirteenth line of the same, strike out 'shall' and insert 'may.'

"3. Insert after the word 'deposition,' at the end of the first clause of said amended Canon, these words, 'And in case the Bishop so abandoning the Communion of the Church be the Presiding Elder, the Bishop next in order of seniority shall be deemed to be, and shall act as, the Presiding Bishop under this Canon.'

"4. After the word 'false,' in the second clause, insert these words, 'and shall demand a trial.'"

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move to concur in the amendments. This provides for such a case as that of Bishop Cummins, who recently left this Church. It has been carefully perfected by the Committee on Canons of this House and of the House of Bishops. It is important that it should be acted upon.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I make objection simply to one phrase in the proposed amendments of the Committee on Canons. I make objection to the idea that the Presiding Bishop of this Church should in any case abandon the Church. I think it is a great wrong to make such a supposition, and I think it would go out to the Church that this Committee on Canons has been rather tired out, and wanted to amuse themselves with a solemn joke on the Diocese of Kentucky. [Laughter.] That is to say, they seem to have the idea that, as the Assistant Bishop of Kentucky has gone and left us, so possibly the Senior Bishop of Kentucky may go and do the same. [Laughter.]

Having made that jest (which I suppose is unconstitutional on my part), I would mention one thing that I object to in a constitutional way. There is such a thing as illegality, and lawyers are well acquainted with it. In drawing up a marriage settlement, for instance, if the man contemplates the possible divorce of the parties, the settlement is invalid, because there are certain things which we must not suppose. I, as a member of this House, do most solemnly protest against the Committee on Canons sitting down and placing on the face of our Canons the supposition that in any case whatsoever the Presiding Bishop may abandon the communion of this Church. The Presiding Bishop is a Bishop, and therefore we get to the bottom of the matter by a general statement that embraces all Bishops whatsoever; but to put in the consideration of the Presiding Bishop abandoning the Communion of this Church is, I think, undignified and improper.

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. I entirely agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and hope this will not pass. I do not propose to suggest to any more Bishops the possibility or feasibility of their withdrawing from this Church. We have legislated and legislated looking to nothing else, it seems, but the abandonment of the ministry, or our doing something that ought not to be done. I think, as the Reverend Deputy from Wisconsin has said, that it is undignified for us to take this action. I hope this resolution will not pass.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. The House of Bishops themselves, in perfecting the present Canon, put in a provision requiring the certificate of the fact of the abandonment of the Communion of this Church, to be made by the Standing Committee of the Dioceses to which the Bishops belonged. In the case of Bishop Cummins, the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Kentucky must make the certificate. The Canon provides that the certificate shall be sent to the presiding Bishop. Now, you see it is important to provide that all the Bishops shall be treated alike; therefore it is provided that, in case the presiding Bishop is the one abandoning, it shall be sent to the Senior Bishop. Otherwise your Canon is ineffective.

We do not legislate at all with reference to the present Bishops. It is a law for this Church for all time to come. I say, of course, that there is no idea of reflecting upon any Bishop now in our House of Bishops. It is a permanent law for the future, and to have a law on our Statute-Book that you could drive a coach and four through would be entirely improper. Make it so that it shall apply to all Bishops; treat them all alike, and the one who happens to be Presiding Bishop is provided for as

well as others. Therefore if any Presiding Bishop hereafter shall abandon the communion of the Church, under the proposition of the Clerical Deputy from New Jersey, there would be no law for him. He could go on and do all the mischief he chose as Presiding Bishop, because there would be no law to dispose of him. We propose that in his case the matter shall go to the next Bishop in seniority under the Canons we have reported.

The canon has been carefully perfected, in view of the recent case we had in our Church, by the Committees of both Houses, and I think it is wise, and should be adopted.

The resolution was agreed to.

The next business on the Calendar was the following report from the Committee on Canons:

"The Committee on Canons have had under consideration Message No. 39 of the House of Bishops, proposing an amendment of Section 1, Canon 6, Title II, 'Of the Abandonment of the Communion of this Church by a Presbyter or Deacon,' and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the House of Deputies concur with the House of Bishops in the proposed amendment of Section 1, Canon 6, Title II, with the following amendment:

"Strike out the word 'and' after the word 'discipline' in the sixth line, and insert the word 'or.'"

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that the resolution be passed.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. What does it amount to?

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I will tell you. After the Cheney and Cummins schism, a Presbyter of the Diocese of Pittsburgh declared that he had not abandoned the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Church, though he favored that movement, because, he said, he had done nothing, and there was a technical difficulty in getting over that word "and." We propose to insert "or" in its place, which seems to be necessary to make it harmonious. It now is: "Abandon the doctrine, discipline, and worship." It requires the three to concur, and he denied having done so, though, in fact, he had gone into that movement, and we could not reach him. By inserting the word "or" in place of "and," it relieves it of the difficulty, and makes it in harmony with our legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF DEACONESSSES.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Joint Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, that the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed 'Canon of Deaconesses or Sisters.'"

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I would say that there has been a joint committee since appointed to take that matter into consideration and to report to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is one of the inestimable privileges of Deputies not members of the Committee on Canons, that they are able to criticise the proceedings of those who are members of that Committee; and without any intention whatsoever of opposing the passage of the resolution now before the House, I do wish to call the attention of the members to the very instructive history of this measure. Whence did it come? From individual impulse? Not at all. It was introduced here by a committee appointed three years ago, composed of three Bishops, three clergymen, and three laymen, who considered the subject for three years and brought in a unanimous report, and unanimously recommended the passage of the proposed Canon. This Committee, be it remembered, in-

cluded among its members the Bishops of three Dioceses, in which there is probably more woman's work done to-day than in all the other Dioceses of the Church put together. The measure, instead of being made the order of the day, as should have been done, was referred to the Committee on Canons, briefly considered by them and disallowed. Now there is every probability this Canon or one substantially identical with it will be introduced in the next General Convention for action. Therefore, the few words I have to say on the subject are not irrelevant.

Many members now present will probably be members of the next General Convention; and in the name of the late Commission that brought in this measure, I ask them earnestly to consider the principles involved in it. The fundamental principle is this: that there shall be no organized work in this Church, wearing the livery of this Church, that is not under Episcopal supervision. In other words, the principle underlying the proposed measure is the very important one of visitatorial rights. I am too much of an Episcopalian. I use the word advisedly, and with regard to its etymological significance—in other words, I have too much faith in the wisdom of the right of inspection in ecclesiastical affairs, not to deprecate the action of the Committee on Canons in disallowing this measure.

A great deal was said in our debate in secret session about a certain community in a neighboring Diocese, which was represented as being of a most objectionable character. Sir, do we desire that feminine counterparts shall spring up all over this land, wholly independent of Episcopal supervision and control?

Many persons will argue that this measure, if carried, will hamper the free development of woman's work. Nothing of the sort. Look at the names of the persons recommending it. Would the Bishop of this Diocese, think you, ever affix his name to a report recommending a Canon which would hamper woman's work? Would the Bishop of Long Island, having under his care at present the most efficient body of Deaconesses in the land, have put his name to a recommendation to hamper woman's work? When you look at the terms of the Canon itself, what is there in it of a restrictive character, save only that to which I have referred, namely, that it ensures the right of Episcopal supervision? All the vexed questions are untouched in it, and purposely and intentionally untouched. Nothing is said about the question of putting women who are officially engaged in the Church's work, in uniform. That whole question is left, as it ought to be left, an open question. Nothing is said about the question of celibacy, another vexed question which ought to be left open in connection with the female diaconate just as much as it is left open in connection with the male diaconate.

Moreover, it is probable that this measure would have received the unanimous support of the Committee on Canons, but for one omission, which might have been supplied in debate, and possible would have been. There was a fear that, while the rights of Bishops were sufficiently guarded, the rights of Presbyters were not; and if a simple amendment had been added, providing that no deaconess or sister, and no community of deaconesses or sisters shall be introduced into a parish against the consent of the settled minister of that parish, undoubtedly the measure would have been carried by almost two-thirds.

I make these remarks knowing very well that the subject will come up in a similar shape three years hence, and hoping if what I have said is true, and commends itself to your judgment as wise and just,

that you will give it some thought during the interval.

One point more, and only one. It has been said that this Commission was appointed to consider the expediency of reviving the primitive order of deaconesses; and therefore it ought to have confined itself to that point only, and because it did not confine itself to that point, therefore this recommendation ought not to be received. Is that quite fair? Suppose that Committee, upon examining the subject, did find that it was not expedient to revive, strictly according to its ancient and primitive form, that order of deaconesses, did that necessarily forbid their bringing in a measure which had to do with woman's work in general and the regulation of it? The simple fact is, that this Commission found a certain state of things existing—namely, persons working as ministering women in the Church, in one Diocese under the name of Sisters, and in another Diocese under the name of Deaconesses. They did not lay down the law on the subject at all. They simply said that so far as Church government is concerned, we will have one uniform *status* for the ministering woman; you may call her Deaconess, if you please; you may call her Sister, if you please; but whatever you call her, if she is regarded as in any sense officially attached to this Church, that official *status* shall be definitive, and we shall know just what it is, and it shall be a *status* that is under Episcopal control.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is again pleasant to find the Convention allowing ten minutes for the discussion of a practical subject. ["Five."] Five here and five there make ten, and it is very encouraging, for this is really a practical subject.

The PRESIDENT. I understand from the Secretary that this matter has been disposed of.

Dr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. No vote has been taken on it yet.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. A Joint Committee has been appointed to consider the subject.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. True, a Joint Committee has been appointed to consider the subject; but the Committee on Canons have a resolution on your Calendar which has never been taken from the Calendar, and we may take it up now and pass it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Go on and make your speech while we are investigating the subject.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I hope those of you who are young enough to be here three years from now will remember that when a practical subject is brought up and referred to the Committee on Canons it is really referred to a committee whose main business it is to prepare specimens of fossilized conservatism. I say this is a practical subject, and only this day I had the pleasure of conveying to the Bishop of Colorado the intelligence that one of the sisters of the Bishop Potter Memorial House, whom he desired to have, would be ready to go back with him, and another expressed a readiness to go in the spring. We are exceedingly anxious to have it brought under Episcopal supervision, and have it receive the sanction of the Church as soon as the Church is prepared to take one step forward in the great work that has been committed to us.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution to discharge the Committee.

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I am glad that what has been said by the Clerical Deputy, my friend from Massachusetts, has put this question in so right a light before the House. The question here concerns not simply an indigenous diaconate, but it has to do with the importation of womanly help from abroad that is here seeking employment,

I think it of the first importance that all such womanly help should be amenable to the authority of the Diocese in which it works, that it should not be responsible to a foreign headship; and while nominally it is so, yet I believe from the testimony of the Bishop of Honolulu, and also of Bishops in this country, it has not been practically so. Therefore the great importance of an indigenous diaconate among our holy and noble women who will devote themselves to the cause of Christ subject to the authority of this Church, and that this Church also shall insist as a condition of help from abroad that it shall be subject to the same rule.

I do not propose to discuss it, but I am very glad it has been brought before the Convention to work in the minds of the members of it until this body assembles again.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. With regard to this matter of "the Female Diaconate and also of Sisterhoods," I think it is one of the most important things that ever have been brought before this Church; and it was brought before the Church prominently by one of the greatest members of the Church, the late Alonzo Potter, Bishop of Pennsylvania. I do hope that in this matter, we shall comply with the request of the Committee on Canons, and adopt their resolution. I propose that the whole matter be referred to the next General Convention for consideration.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. A Joint Committee has been appointed to take into consideration this whole subject during the recess, and report to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I withdraw the motion I made, and move that it be referred to that Joint Committee.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. Why cannot the Canon be passed now?

The PRESIDENT. Because we have raised a Joint Commission and referred the matter to it, and no Canon is reported to us. The resolution reported from the Committee on Canons is that they be discharged from the consideration of the subject.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. And I hope it will be understood, Mr. President, that this report was not made through any lukewarmness or indifference to the work.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I should like to hear from the Committee why we cannot consider this practical subject, one of great importance, now. This putting off till to-morrow what ought to be done to-day, and the Church to lose all the benefit of active work, it seems to me, speaks a want of efficiency in the Episcopal Church which ought not to be charged against it. Now—

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I was about to answer the gentleman, and I think I can answer him to his satisfaction. The Committee on Canons had referred to them the report of the Committee, to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred. That Committee was in the terms of the resolution creating it for the consideration of the expediency of reviving the primitive order of Deaconesses. That was the subject before the Committee. It was upon that subject that their report was to be made. The Committee on Canons found that the Canon which was proposed by the Committee was on Deaconesses, or Sistershoods. There was an order of Deaconesses in the ancient Church, most undoubtedly, but we found throughout this Canon that the word "sister" and "sisterhood" was used as synonymous with the word "deaconess." We were not prepared to say how far these two were identical, and therefore we preferred to separate them, and to leave the whole matter of the management and control of sisterhoods to the several Dioceses. Meanwhile, a

Joint Commission has been raised to take this whole subject into consideration, and to report to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. ABERCROMBIE, of New Jersey. I move that the Committee on Canons be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Rev. Dr. KNICKERBACKER, of Minnesota. This matter was referred to a Joint Commission at the last General Convention. They have had the matter under consideration, and they have reported to us a Canon, the result of their deliberation and judgment. Why cannot that be called up and proposed at this convention? Do we expect that a new Commission can deliberate further, or enter more fully into the whole question? The whole question, I consider, was referred to a Commission three years ago, and they have settled upon this Canon. It seems to me we ought to adopt it, and not put off practical legislation of this kind so long.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Was that Canon adopted by the House of Bishops?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir.

The SECRETARY. The whole matter was referred, by the action of the two Houses, to a Joint Committee to report at the next Convention.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. The Canon, then, is not before us?

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts. I would remind the House that the Chairman of the new Commission, namely, the Bishop of the Diocese of Alabama, is in full accord with the language of the Canon as reported to this House. There is not the slightest doubt that, so far as he is able to shape the doings of this commission, it will bring in identically this measure. Therefore, if this House is prepared at this late day to pass the measure as introduced by the Committee, which considered it for three years carefully, then you will just save the Commission so much trouble. I am not very anxious about it, but I think if it can be done it would be well to be done.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I have only a remark to make. The subject, of course, is an exceedingly important one. It is one that involves, I suppose, the most earnest work in this Church now. If we postpone the passage of any Canon until the next General Convention, we are not stopping this work. It is going on. The lay Deputy from Pennsylvania has just told us that this very day a member of that most admirable institution, the Bishop Potter Memorial House, has decided to join the Bishop of Colorado; and other Deaconesses are doing their work. We do not stop any work by considering this matter a little longer. It surely would do no harm to give three years more to the consideration of what is, the best practical way of organizing this most important labor. Therefore it seems to me that we can safely adopt this resolution, discharging the Committee on Canons, as we have already permitted a Joint Commission to go on with its labors. We shall then be prepared at the next General Convention to come to some definite and positive legislation, and not do it in a hasty way now. Meanwhile the work will not be interfered with in the least; it will go on whichever; action we take.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I call for the reading of the Report of the Committee on Canons. I think that will give the House full information as to the ground upon which we acted.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred the Canon reported by the Joint Committee appointed at the last General Convention, respectfully report that they are unable to recommend the passage of said Canon as it has come to them, for the reason that it is not sufficiently explicit as to what is to be understood by the word 'Deaconess,'

Throughout the proposed Canon the word *Sister* is used as synonymous with 'Deaconess'; although, as it appears to this Committee, there is a marked difference between the Order of Deaconesses, as described by early Christian writers, and the association of Christian women now existing under the name of Sisterhoods. While we fully appreciate the value and usefulness of the service rendered by these Sisterhoods, we are not prepared to make them identical with an order of ministers which undoubtedly existed in the Primitive Church, but regarding whose official position therein we have so little certain knowledge. The Committee therefore do not deem it expedient to legislate at present upon the subject of the Order of Deaconesses; and they prefer to leave the subject of the Sisterhoods to such action as each Diocese may judge wise and proper for itself.

"They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed 'Canon of Deaconesses or Sisters.'"

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. May I simply say that those who are curious on the subject will find the original Canon reported on page 60 of THE DAILY CHURCHMAN, and that the Committee on Canons considered these two subjects as different in themselves. They did not feel willing at present to make this legislation on the subject of Deaconesses; they did not feel prepared to go on with it; and as to sisterhoods they thought it was altogether better that the arrangements, laws, and rules of sisterhoods should be left for each Diocese to regulate by itself. It is no aversion to the work, but it is simply a judgment that it is unwise at present to legislate, either for one or the other, in the Convention.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution reported by the Committee on Canons.

The resolution was agreed to.

PAROCHIAL TEACHING.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is Report No. 28, from the Committee on Canons, as follows:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred Message No. 27, from the House of Bishops, proposing an additional section to Canon 19 of Title I., 'Of Parochial Instruction,' respectfully report that they have considered the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concur with the House of Bishops in the adoption of an additional section to be added to Canon 19, Title I., as proposed by the House of Bishops in their Message No. 27, with the amendment that the said section shall read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Ministers shall also be diligent in teaching the people committed to their charge according to the doctrine of Christ; observing and inculcating Christian holiness of life; rebuking gaming, intemperance, licentious theatrical amusements, and all amusements involving cruelty to the brute creation; repressing all ungodliness, covetousness, and worldliness; exhorting to the maintenance of family worship and the due observance of the Lord's Day; and calling upon parents and sponsors to train their children and god-children, both by precept and example, faithfully to observe their Baptismal vows."

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. I move that we concur with the House of Bishops.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. We recommend concurrence in the amended form.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. What are the amendments?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. It would be impossible to say without first reading the origi-

nal message, and I have not that. It is simply a change of language. The same substance is aimed at in both.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I myself and a large number of the Committee on Canons are opposed to this kind of legislation, to undertake to interfere with pastoral duties and to enumerate a lot of special duties without naming the hundredth part of them. We undertake to take up the details of a minister's work, and specify a few items, making a small decalogue, and leaving all the rest out. Now, there is no limit where you can begin to specify what a minister shall teach; there is no limit as to what he shall take up, and I think we have done enough when we have laid down, as we did in our Nineteenth Canon, some general duties as to keeping the Lord's Day, etc.; but when we undertake to say what he shall teach on this subject and on that, in regard to theatres, dancing, etc., we are opening the door to an enumeration that there is no end to, and we are implied to sanction everything else that is not there enumerated. It is the duty of this Church to lay down general rules for the laity. It adopts the principles of the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, and the minister can teach such specific things as he thinks proper. If you look at the Nineteenth Canon, and then look at what is proposed to be added, I think it will be seen that there is serious objection to this special legislation. I, for one, was opposed to the report, and a large number of others in the Committee; but, as one or two members persisted in it, we finally concluded that the report should be made. I wish each clergyman here would look at it for himself; he is more competent to judge of it than I, a layman; but, to my mind, there is serious objection to all this kind of legislation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I merely want to ask whether circuses, cock-fighting, and bull-baiting are mentioned? [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. They are implied.

Mr. President, when this matter was first brought up I spoke about it and its importance, and I want to say now, in reply to the objection to legislation on this subject, that I am acquainted with some of the legislation of the Primitive Church, and that the main business of that legislation was to make the members of that Church holy and devout; and with regard to this amendment to the Nineteenth Canon, I say that we just do that thing. We come forward and say by our legislation to the members of this Church that it is the business of our clergy to teach them, not simply Apostolic succession, the doctrine of the ministry, etc., but that, as members of this Church—the Church which I calculate is to be the Catholic Church of this country—they be holy in life and doctrine; and I look upon this amendment to the Nineteenth Canon to be very distinctly and clearly a declaration upon that point. I see no difficulty whatsoever in the objections that have been made against it by my distinguished friend Judge Otis, of Illinois.

I hope, therefore, that the members of this Convention, the clergy, both High and Low, who want holiness of life and doctrine written on the banners of this Church, and the laity who want morality and truth according to the best morality—that is, the morality of our Lord Jesus Christ—taught by this Church, will not listen to any picking of flaws or fault-finding, but will give us this resolution as it has come from the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Dr. PARET, of Central Pennsylvania. I would ask the Reverend Deputy, who has just closed, whether it is intended that this Canon here proposed shall be an amendment to the Decalogue or an amendment to the Sermon on the Mount. Which one is it proposed to improve? We have a

standard of morality set forth by the Church. We have in our constant work in the Church the principles of Christian morality held up, and held up in language better, stronger, and clearer than could possibly be set forth in that Canon.

Rev. Dr. ADAMS, of Wisconsin. In reply I would ask the reading of the Canon as proposed to be amended.

The Secretary read the resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. To properly appreciate and understand this section, it is well to look at the scope of the Canon which is to be amended. The Canon is a very brief one, and in Title I. is an injunction upon the ministers of our Church to be diligent in catechetical instruction, and also in instruction in informing the youth and others in the doctrine, Constitution, and Liturgy of the Church. It will be observed that the Canon as it now stands is simply an injunction upon clergymen to instruct children and others in the Catechism, and in the doctrine, Constitution, and Liturgy of the Church. The proposed amendment changes the entire character and scope of the Canon.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I think if I understand it right this is another section to be added to that.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. It is added, but I say it changes its entire character and scope. The present Canon is based upon the assumption that every clergyman in this Church inculcates morality, and what is more than morality, spirituality and holiness of life, and it did not deem it necessary that the duty which was imposed by the injunction of Holy Writ, and the very nature of their offices, should be made in the form of a Canon. I understand it is charged from outside that we do not inculcate Christian morality and spirituality, but that we only require teaching in the Catechism, Doctrine, Constitution, and Liturgy of the Church. If it is deemed proper to meet that absurd charge, then it would suffice to terminate the Canon at that part of it which enjoins upon the clergyman also to inculcate Christian holiness of life; and that is as far as we can go if we follow the example, as I understand it, of our Divine Master, and the record He has left for us. He has not undertaken to define and specify the particular things which Christians may or may not do, because that partakes of the nature of the law which He intended to supersede; but He gave us a universal law, love to God, and love to our neighbor. He gave us directions in the Sermon on the Mount for the whole field of human duty, and this new law which He gave to us of love, is the expansion and interpretation of the ancient law given by Moses, if I have been properly instructed by my clergyman.

Now, Mr. President, my objection to this is that it is too exclusive. As some one expressed it to me, *expressio unius exclusio alterius*. If you express one or two things, you will have next year something else to be added specifically, and, it seems to me, we shall be only safe in making this matter general, as the Christian law is general.

There is another very important reason. Differences of opinion will exist about some things, and men must stand or fall in such matters by their own consciences. It is between them and their God, and you cannot impose any duty upon a clergyman that will alter the freedom of opinion of individuals on such subjects. I move that all after the word "holiness" be stricken from the Canon.

Rev. Mr. JENNINGS, of Missouri. We are already required to teach the Catechism. We cannot teach the Catechism without teaching the Ten Commandments. We cannot teach the Ten Commandments without teaching the Sermon on the Mount

explanatory of them. What more do we want? I move to lay the whole subject on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to lay the whole matter on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

MINISTERS OFFICIATING IN OTHER CURES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the report of the Committee on Canons, in reference to a proposed amendment to Section 6, of Canon 12, of Title I., relating to the officiating of Ministers within the cures of others, to which is appended the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Section 6, of Canon 12, of Title I."

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. The object of that resolution was to cover clergymen whose consciences are very tender with regard to officiating at funerals and other services at which they are obliged to officiate outside the limits of their own parishes. For example, those of us who are located in large towns or cities are sometimes obliged to go to cemeteries and to officiate outside of our own Church districts, and there certainly can be no harm in passing that addition to the Canons only intended to meet such cases. I hope, therefore, the report of the Committee will not be accepted.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I will explain the action of the Committee. It was proposed to amend our law so that a clergyman may go into the parochial cure of another and officiate at funerals, etc., without asking leave of the parochial rector. It was opposed by the Reverend Chairman of our Committee, on the ground that if we commence letting down the bars in this direction, it would be done in other things, and lead to trouble perhaps; and that is the secret of the whole thing.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TITLE OF HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business is the report of the Committee on Canons, relating to the title of this House, being the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the House of Deputies, in making up the proceedings of the General Convention, and in the publication of the Journal of 1874, to strike out the words 'House of Clerical and Lay Deputies' wherever they occur, and insert instead thereof the words 'House of Deputies.'"

The resolution was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT. The next business on the Calendar is the following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Section 1 of Canon 2, Title III., be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. In every Diocese there shall be a Standing Committee composed of an equal number of Presbyters and laymen, communicants of the Church, to be appointed by the Convention thereof, whose duties, except so far as provided for by the Canons of the General Convention, may be prescribed by the Canons of the respective Dioceses. They shall elect from their own body a president and a secretary. They may meet on their own adjournment from time to time; and the President shall have power to summon special meetings whenever he shall deem it necessary."

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. I move the indefinite postponement of that resolution, and I will give my reasons.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. Dr. Stearns consents that

the Committee on Canons may explain their amendment. You will notice that the Standing Committee of this Church, in each Diocese, is authorized and provided for by Canons of the General Convention. It is a creature of the General Convention. The Standing Committees are appointed in each Diocese by the Diocesan Conventions. But, to come right to the point, the question is this: In every Diocese but three these Committees are composed of clergymen and laymen. The Dioceses of Connecticut, Maryland and Easton have, from time immemorial, from their first organization after the Revolution, had their Standing Committees composed entirely of clergymen. In all other Dioceses they are composed of clergymen and laymen.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. One word about Connecticut. At one time they changed and admitted laymen, and gave it up again.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. All who are familiar with the history of this Church know that the idea of introducing the laity was strongly opposed by Bishop Seabury, the first Bishop of Connecticut. There was then a fierce controversy, and finally a compromise. The laity were introduced into the General Convention, without which, as Bishop White repeatedly said, we never could have organized under our general Constitution. The laity are equal in this House, equal in the legislation of this House, equal in their constitutional rights. This provision now as proposed, of course, is to make the law of the General Convention the law of the whole Church, that there shall be a Standing Committee in each Diocese, and that that Standing Committee shall be composed of an equal number of clergymen and laymen.

It is claimed that this should be done for a special reason. Two-thirds of our Bishops are elected during the interval between the meetings of the General Convention. The laity have no voice in passing upon the credentials of Bishops-elect unless they are placed in these Standing Committees. Therefore, to preserve the rights of the three orders, the Bishops, clergy, and laity, this principle should extend into the Standing Committees of the Dioceses. If a Bishop is elected after the adjournment of this General Convention in three Dioceses of this Church, the laity are not exalted into taking part in the testimonials, but only the clergymen. To secure harmony, therefore, you will see the position of the Committee in this matter, and we do not understand that it meets with any serious opposition from those Dioceses; that at least is the information of the Committee on Canons; and now, when we have authorized, in this body, these Standing Committees, shall we go a step further and say that they shall be composed of an equal number of clergymen and laymen? The whole Church has practised upon this except the three Dioceses named. We have the clear constitutional right, in my opinion, to insist that their Standing Committees shall be composed of the two orders, the clergy and laity, in equal number. I have no doubt about that. Whether it is wise or politic to insist upon it is the question.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. As a Deputy from a Diocese that limits its representation in the Standing Committee to the clerical order, I ask leave to say a few words on this subject. No proposition to change the Canons and the Constitution of our Church has surprised me more than this. Suggested amendments of the Constitution, which had in them a clear sense of justice and right, have been passed over very summarily this session, and scarcely received attention enough to consider their merits; but here is a proposition to abridge the liberty of the Dioceses in a matter which does not concern the Church at large, which affects only two

or three Dioceses. I cannot see that the prosperity of the parishes in New York or Illinois is affected by the fact that Maryland, Easton, and Connecticut compose their Standing Committee of clergymen alone.

I have objections to this proposition independent of the arbitrary character of it. It provides that the Standing Committee shall be composed of equal numbers of the two orders, and questions may arise when one order would balance the other, and thus no decision be reached.

But I have still stronger objections. Connecticut is the Primal Diocese of this land, and came originally into the ecclesiastical union with reluctance, because her first Bishop, Seabury, had doubts about, or was opposed to, the introduction of the lay element into our Church legislature. My reading of history does not show that there was any very great struggle upon that matter. Connecticut gave up all her preferences and cordially acceded to the General Constitution; and I challenge any one to show that from that day to this she has not been as loyal as her sisters to the Church and as devoted to the advancement of its Apostolic principles.

This Convention, under its General Constitution, has no right to say that we shall have our Standing Committee composed of an equal number of clergymen and laymen. What we have is in the nature of a chartered right, and there is nothing in the Constitution which authorizes this body to introduce the laity into the Standing Committee of Connecticut.

It has been said that it was practised to some extent in Connecticut. I would like to know where that history was obtained. Two attempts within my memory have been made to introduce the laity into the Standing Committee of Connecticut, but in both cases the attempts were defeated by the laity themselves. They refused to reverse the history and precedents of the Diocese in a matter which has come down to us from Seabury's time. It is true when Bishop Hobart provisionally administered the Diocese, accustomed as he was to the practice of his own New York, he did succeed in getting into the Standing Committee of Connecticut, for a single year, a lay element; but they dropped it the very next year, and thereafter fixed in their constitution a provision that the Standing Committee should be composed of clergymen alone. Before that, when we acceded to the general Constitution, nothing was said in our Constitution about the orders composing the Standing Committee. It was taken for granted that the clergy would be chosen, and no other order. As I have said, what we have is in the nature of a chartered right, and you cannot take it away from us.

More than that, Mr. President, it is fixed in our Constitution that the Standing Committee shall be chosen at the Annual Convention of the Diocese, and shall be composed of five clerical members. If you pass this Canon you put us to inconvenience if you do not make it practically inoperative, for we cannot change our Constitution under two years, and then only by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the Diocesan Convention.

Now, sir, what is the advantage to be gained by this measure? All that I hear said is that it will bring the Dioceses into harmony and make them uniform. Is it necessary to have a Canon for this purpose? Do Maryland, and Easton, and Connecticut show themselves to be without the line now? Does the Diocese which I have the honor of representing on this floor fail to keep step with the Church as she marches on triumphantly to victory here and to victory there, or would she by this change be any more valuable in the warfare with the kingdom of Satan, or furnish better records of her zeal and reverence?

Now, sir, this is a mere theory, and it may well

be left to slumber in the arms of the Committee reporting it. When Connecticut is ready to part with a cherished vestige of her ancient history, or when she can be made to see that her example, or the example of Maryland and Easton, is the least obstruction to the progress of the Church, then pass your Canon, and we will graciously submit to its direction; not before.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, having introduced this proposition, I feel bound to answer some of the arguments of the Deputy from Connecticut. He says that it is a mere theory. Why, sir, if there is a fixed principle in our Church, this is a principle. I would state that before introducing it, it was my privilege to confer with the Bishop of Maryland and the Bishop of Connecticut. The Bishop of Connecticut, while he would have been glad to have this change deferred until after his death, admitted that it was right, and that if made, he would accede to it. The Bishop of Maryland thought that there were constitutional impediments, but he, too, I understood, would be glad to have the change made. I asked him if there were any persons in this House with whom I could confer about the question. He instanced Chief Justice Waite, and two others. I got them together, and they examined it, and saw no difficulty whatever, believing that the power rests with us. I believe we understand that in the early history of the Church, when the approval of Bishops-elect was entirely with the Convention, and it was not expected that the Standing Committees would act, the General Convention was chary about touching this matter; but the moment the Standing Committees become our agents and our representatives, they cannot represent us except they be organized on the very principle of our Constitution. The Dioceses may have Standing Committees for their own purposes and make them all of the laity or all of the clergy; but if they be our Standing Committees, to do our work, to examine the fitness of a Bishop-elect for the office, and if they are to perform the new duty we have just assigned to them in the Canon of Ritual, we cannot, according to my view, give them a power which we have not ourselves. We have no power to say to the clerical members of this Convention, "You may examine a person upon any particular thing," and yet we tell the Diocesan Standing Committees that they may be made of all clergy or all laity without any restriction.

I think gentlemen can easily see that there is a principle which lies at the very foundation structure of our Church, and when we rise up or ask the dioceses to raise up Standing Committees to perform certain important duties, they should be made to correspond precisely with the principles of our Church. If it be a mere theory, then Connecticut and Maryland and Easton may continue as they are, and if they so continue there is nothing to hinder us from having every Standing Committee in the whole Church composed entirely of clergy or entirely of laymen.

I recollect once visiting an insane hospital, and one of the men inside said to me: "We are not insane; we are sane; but we are in the minority now and we are inside. By-and-by when we get in the majority, you will all be in here and we shall be out."

It may be that in some Dioceses the laity may have the upper hand; in others the clergy may have the upper hand; and so we may have our Standing Committees, composed sometimes altogether of laity and sometimes altogether of clergy. The three Dioceses named, so far as we know, are the only Dioceses that have Standing Committees composed entirely of clergymen; and from what I have heard from their Bishops, I am inclined to believe that if the change be made, if we have the power to make

the change, it will be altogether agreeable to them.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I do not propose to discuss this question; I only wish to say that this is an important question involving the most important rights of Dioceses. There is a very small portion of the Convention here, and I understand even a less proportion present in the House of Bishops. I therefore move to postpone this question to the next General Convention.

Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY, of Connecticut. I object to that. The question is on indefinite postponement.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I had not heard that motion.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Georgia. I desire to say a single word, and it is upon the constitutional question. There are very serious doubts in my mind whether we can do this, notwithstanding the opinion which seems to have been given by Chief-Justice Waite. I differ *toto cælo* from him on that point, but perhaps it may be owing to the different legal schools in which we have been brought up. Let me illustrate this matter. Suppose the Congress of the United States propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. They refer them to the States; and, as everybody knows, the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States may agree to it, and amend the Constitution. But will it be pretended that Congress can say to those States, "You must elect your Legislatures thus and so; you must amend your Constitution as to the mode in which you elect your State Legislatures"? Not at all. It must accept the Legislatures of the States as the means by which it proposes an amendment to the Constitution. There is another mode pointed out, by which the Constitution of the United States may be amended; and that is by calling a convention, which Congress also has the power to do. If they are dissatisfied with the Legislatures of the States, as the States present them, then they must resort to the other method, but they cannot go down to the States and say: "You must elect your Legislatures thus and so." That is an infringement upon the constitutional rights of the States, and Congress cannot do it. So, I apprehend, here we cannot do any such thing; we cannot say to the different Dioceses of the general Church, "You must elect such and such members to your Standing Committees." We must accept the Standing Committees as the Dioceses present them to us. If the objection be raised that the laity ought to be represented in the choice of Bishops, then we must resort to the other alternative which is in our power; we must require all the Bishops, whether elected within six months before the sitting of this General Convention, or not, to be presented to us. That is the only way in which we can act.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Kentucky. I concur with the Deputy last up, except that I am more strong in my convictions that this proposition is clearly unconstitutional. It certainly ought not to be passed without a thorough examination of the question of power. Sir, these Dioceses are confederated Dioceses, within one General Convention, and I say to the Deputy from Pennsylvania, for whom I entertain great respect, that he will fail in his object for the reason that this Convention cannot force any Diocese to choose a Bishop except as that Diocese shall please.

The Fourth Article of this Constitution says: "The Bishop or Bishops in every Diocese shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of the Diocese." The Diocesan Convention, under its Constitution, may exclude its laity, and why not? Who shall dare to say that

they shall not? Have we any power to force a Diocese to send representatives to this Convention? Clearly not. They will be bound by your acts, but you cannot, unless that Diocese chooses to send representatives here, have it represented. I utterly deny the power of this General Convention, much as I desire conformity and uniformity, to undertake to impose on a Diocese in the exercise of its individual, constitutional Diocesan rights, the giving up of any privilege which they have had once, which has not been taken from them by the Constitution. So far from that being the case, the Constitution recognizes the constitutional right of each Diocese, respectively, to elect a Bishop in its own way; and there is no lawyer and no judge, and no member of this Convention, I think, who will say, looking at that provision, that a Diocesan Convention, if it pleases, by a unanimous vote of its Diocese may not frame a Constitution which shall exclude the laity from representation in their Diocesan Standing Committee. That being the case, I think we stand on tender ground, and we ought not to pass this Canon until the question has been examined. I hope it will be postponed.

Mr. STARK, of Connecticut. I concur, Mr. President, most heartily in the opinion expressed by the learned Deputies from Kentucky and Georgia in relation to the constitutional questions involved in the proposition before the House, and I rise, particularly on behalf of the laity of the Diocese of Connecticut, to enter a respectful protest against the action that is proposed here upon this question. I believe I speak the sentiments of the laity of that Diocese when I say that we are heartily in concurrence with the opinion expressed to the House by my clerical colleague from that Diocese, and that this House ought not, under these circumstances, to press this question to a vote, but ought to indefinitely postpone it as has been proposed.

Rev. Dr. KIDNEY, of Minnesota. Mr. President, this is not a question of how a Bishop shall be elected by a Diocese, so that the argument of the Lay Deputy from Kentucky is not relevant. It is a question as to the confirmation of a Bishop who has been elected. When a Bishop has been elected by a Diocese, as we know, that election must come before the Standing Committees of the several Dioceses and must be passed upon. Shall those Standing Committees be some of them composed of clergymen alone, or shall they be composed of clergymen and laymen for the sake of uniformity? That is the question. I am clearly of opinion that this is a constitutional question, and that we have not the constitutional right to make this change. Nevertheless, the object desired is, I think, a worthy one; not that we should interfere with the position of the Standing Committees, leaving so their several Dioceses to determine what they shall be, but that we should ensure, by some provision of canonical consent, that the election of a Bishop should be made not only by the clergy, but by the laity of every Diocese in the land. Therefore, I contend that we are not prepared to accede to this proposition, on the ground that it does touch the constitutional rights of Dioceses. I am also prepared to state that we should refer the matter back to the Committee on Canons, in order that they may mature some resolution, some Canon, or some legislation whereby the question may be reached; that is to say, whereby uniformity shall prevail throughout the Church in this land, that in the confirmation of a Bishop-elect, the laity of every Diocese, as well as the clergy, shall be represented, and shall give their consent.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. I would enquire, first of all, whether any memorials have

been sent up to this House, requesting this change, from the laity of the Diocese of Connecticut?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. No; the measure came without any memorial.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Have any memorials been sent in from the Diocese of Maryland from the laity?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. No, sir.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Have any been sent in from the laity of the Diocese of Easton?

Rev. Dr. STEARNS, of Easton. No, sir.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. We are told the attempt was made in the Diocese of Connecticut, and was voted down by the laity. I have also been informed that the attempt has been made in the Diocese of Maryland, and has been voted down by the laity. And so far as it seems to me now, after the answers to my questions, it would appear that the change is memorialized for in these three Dioceses by no person but the Lay Deputy from Pennsylvania. Under these circumstances, and considering that the two Dioceses of Connecticut and Maryland (Easton being formed out of Maryland and partaking of its usage) are two of our oldest Dioceses, our old historic Dioceses, and a great majority of those represented now on this floor are comparatively mere upstarts in comparison with them. I think it is exceedingly out of character for us to try to force upon those Dioceses a change which they do not desire, and have refused to accept of their own free motion.

One other word. In each of these Dioceses, if I am rightly informed, the members of the Standing Committee, although consisting of clergy only, are elected by the votes of both orders. It needs a con current vote by both orders before any man can be elected on the Standing Committee; and if the laity are satisfied with that mode of representation, there is no call upon the part of any one else that I can see to interfere, and I would especially desire to put down the spirit of meddling where it is none of our business, where there is no call to meddle, and where we had better consider the old question of Lord Melbourne. When people wanted to bring in changes for which there was no use, he would always say, "Can't you let it alone?" I move to lay the whole subject on the table.

The PRESIDENT. The hour for recess has arrived, but if the House is ready, the Chair will put the question on the motion to lay on the table.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Rev. Dr. Watson desires me to withdraw the motion, and I do so.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I will renew it in a moment. I desire to express my own dissent, as a member of the Committee on Canons, from the measure reported. It does seem to be an unnecessary interference with Dioceses. If the laity of any Diocese choose to express their will through the clergy of the Diocese, I maintain that they have a perfect right to do so. It is no repression of the voice of the laity whatever, but simply their way of being represented. Now, as bound, I renew the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. Let me ask the gentleman who made the motion to withdraw it for a moment that I may renew the motion for indefinite postponement, for this reason: a question laid on the table may be called up, and I do not think this House should hold that power in their hands in regard to the matter.

The PRESIDENT. This will certainly not be called up again at this session. The question is on the motion to lay the subject on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The House will now take a recess until two o'clock.

At two o'clock the House resumed its session.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I move that the House agree to the report of the Joint Committee of Conference in regard to the disagreement between the two Houses in reference to an amendment of Section 1, of Canon 1, of Title III.

The report was read as follows :

"The Joint Committee of Conference, appointed to consider the disagreement between the two Houses in regard to an amendment to Section 1, of Canon 1, Title III., proposed by the House of Deputies, respectfully report that they recommend the adoption of the proposed amendment, with the alteration of the words 'each House of the General Convention,' to 'the House of Deputies,' as expressed in the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the following clause be added to Section 1, of Canon 1, of Title III., of the Digest:

"[4] The Rules and Orders of the House of Deputies shall be in force in the ensuing General Convention until the organization thereof, and until they be amended or repealed by the said House."

The resolution was agreed to.

ABSENCE OF CLERGYMEN.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the Calendar is the following resolution, reported from the Committee on Canons :

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the proposed amendment to Canon 7 of Title II.: 'Of a Clergyman absenting himself from his Diocese.'"

The resolution was agreed to.

TESTIMONIALS OF BISHOPS-ELECT.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons :

"Resolved, That the subject of procedure of this House, in its action upon the testimonials of Bishops-elect, be referred to a Special Committee of five, to consider and report to the next General Convention."

Rev. Dr. WILLIAMS, of Georgia. I move that that be laid on the table. It is too important a subject to be acted on now.

The motion was agreed to.

STUDENTS IN SEMINARIES.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution from the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from consideration of the subject of pastoral charge of students in Theological Seminaries," etc.

The resolution was agreed to.

INHIBITION OF ACCUSED MINISTERS.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That this House do not concur with the House of Bishops in the amendment of Canon 2, Title II., proposed to this House in Message No. 40, from the House of Bishops, relating to the inhibition of an accused minister."

The resolution was agreed to.

MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution, reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That Clause 1, of Section 17, of Canon 13, of Title I., is hereby amended by the insertion of the words:

'On the written request of twelve members to the same,' after the word 'shall,' in the sixth line, so as to read as follows :

"Sec. 17. [1.] If during the recess of the General Convention, and more than six months previous to its session, any vacancy arise, either by death, resignation, or other cause, in the office of any Missionary Bishop of this Church (whether domestic or foreign), the House of Bishops shall, on the written request of twelve members of the same, be convened by the Presiding Bishop, or, in case of his death, by the Bishop who, according to the rules of the House of Bishops, is to preside at the next General Convention ; and thereupon may proceed to fill any and every such vacancy that may then exist, by electing a suitable person or persons to be a Bishop or Bishops of this Church, to exercise Episcopal functions within the district, place, country, territory, station, or jurisdiction, where such vacancy or vacancies may exist ; and in case of such election, they shall, by the Presiding Bishop, or by some person or persons specially appointed, communicate the fact of such election to the Standing Committees of the Churches in the different Dioceses ; and each Standing Committee that shall consent to the proposed consecration shall forward the evidence of such consent to the Presiding Bishop, or Bishop aforesaid. And if the major number of the Standing Committees shall consent to the proposed consecration, the Presiding or other Bishop as aforesaid shall forward copies of the evidence of such consent to each Bishop of this Church then within the limits of the United States ; and if a majority of such Bishops consent to the consecration, the Presiding Bishop or Bishop aforesaid, with any two Bishops, or any three Bishops to whom he may communicate the testimonials, may proceed to perform the same."

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. That is an important amendment to the Canon in respect to a Special Session of the House of Bishops during the recess of the General Convention. As it now stands, it rests with the option of the Senior Bishop to call a Special Session. This Canon provides that if any twelve members of the House request the Senior Bishop to call a session, it shall be called. Important property rights are liable to be involved and other important matters ; and it should not be left to the discretion of one Bishop whether the vacancy be filled or put off to the next General Convention. Therefore, it is wisely provided that any twelve Bishops may require the meeting of the House of Bishops to fill a vacancy in the office of Missionary Bishop.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Does it not now read "shall"?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. It is amended to read "may."

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Then it is not to be convened unless twelve members request it?

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. There must be twelve to make the request. It is a very good amendment.

The resolution was agreed to.

ACTION OF HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons :

"Resolved, That this House do not concur with the House of Bishops in the amendment to Section 2, of Canon 13, Title I., proposed to this House in Message No. 42, and relating to the consent of the House of Bishops to the consecration of Bishops-elect."

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I hope that will be explained.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The object of the Committee was to avoid making it

dependent upon the vote of the Foreign Missionary Bishops to affect the majority.

The resolution was agreed to.

STATUS OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolution reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of the *status* of Missionary Bishops," etc.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I express my gratitude to the Committee on Canons for bringing that matter up so promptly for consideration. [Laughter.]

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. We did the best we could.

The resolution was agreed to.

CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS.

The next business on the Calendar was the following resolutions, reported by the Committee on Canons:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be discharged from the consideration of the subject of the testimonials of candidates for Holy Orders."

The resolution was agreed to

The PRESIDENT. The Calendar is through with.

THANKS TO PRESIDENT CRAIK.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. There is a duty devolving on me, of offering a few resolutions of courtesy. I now offer the following:

"Resolved, That the thanks of this House be presented to the Rev. Dr. Craik, its presiding officer, in testimony of its warm appreciation of his eminent services during the protracted sessions of this body, discharging, as he has done, the difficult duties of his office with singular fidelity."

I ask the Secretary to put the question on this resolution.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. I suggest that the question be put by a rising vote.

The SECRETARY. Those in favor of the resolution will rise.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

SYNODS OF DIOCESES.

A message (No. 104) from the House of Bishops announced that it did not concur in the Message No. 109, from the House of Deputies, appointing a Joint Commission as to needed legislation for the formation of Synods of Dioceses, for the reason that, at this late day of the session, it is impossible for the House to give the matter due consideration.

TITLE OF HOUSE OF DEPUTIES.

A message (No. 105) from the House of Bishops announced that that House had concurred in Message No. 113 from the House of Deputies, concerning the striking out of words "clerical and lay" in the Journal.

ITALIAN PRAYER-BOOK.

A message (No. 106) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That a joint committee be appointed to prepare and report to the next General Convention a correct revision of the Prayer-Book in the Italian Language."

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I move that we concur in that message, and I would suggest the names of the Rev. Dr. Nevin, the Rev. C. Souder, and Professor F. T. Nash as that commission.

The motion was agreed to.

THANKS TO SECRETARY PERRY.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this House desires to express its sense of the valuable services of its distinguished Secretary, and hereby offers to him, with their salutations, a unanimous vote of thanks."

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

THANKS TO REV. DR. MEAD.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I now offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That regretting the absence from the later deliberations and closing services of the Convention of Rev. Dr. Mead, Chairman of the Committee on Canons, the venerable and revered Nestor of this House, we would hereby place on record our testimony to the importance of the great labors he has performed, and the invaluable services he has rendered as a member of this Body to the Church at large.

"Resolved, That after membership in sixteen consecutive General Conventions of this Church until now he is verging on four-score years, we feel it fitting that a record should be made of the gratitude of this Church and the love of the members of this House to him, who we certify is eminently worthy of the one and the other."

The PRESIDENT. It would be eminently proper, much more than the vote you took a little while ago, that this resolution should be adopted by a rising vote. Those in favor of the resolution will rise.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

THE FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That when this House adjourn this afternoon it be to half-past seven this evening, to Calvary Church (Twenty-first Street and Fourth Avenue), and that after the religious services, including the reading of the Pastoral Letter, this House do stand finally adjourned."

The object of the resolution is to avoid the offering of the resolution after the religious services this evening.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Before that resolution is acted upon, I wish the attention of the Convention. I wish to move the reconsideration of a vote which was taken some time since, naming Calvary Church as the place where the final services are to be held. The rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, of this city, very kindly offered us, a few days ago, the use of his church for these services, and the only ground on which we declined to accept his offer was that we preferred to remain in this church, where we have held our sessions. I think it must be felt by every member of the Convention that something is due as an act of courtesy to the Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, if we propose to leave here and go somewhere else. I move, therefore, a reconsideration of that vote, for the purpose of moving that we have our closing services in the Church of the Holy Trinity.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. I will merely state that that is impossible. We concurred with the House of Bishops in fixing Calvary Church, and notice was sent to the afternoon papers. It is published, and it will be impossible to make the change now. I agree with the reverend gentleman that something should be done in the matter he mentions, but the Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity was not within reach at the moment; it was a very sudden thing; the House of Bishops thought that as it was election day they could not well come here to-night, and they then thought of

Calvary Church, and telegraphed and obtained permission to use it, and came to us, and we concurred. I do think that something should be said to the rector of the church who made the previous offer.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. The rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity is present in this building, and has said that we can have the use of his church most certainly.

Rev. Dr. FARRINGTON, of New Jersey. I call attention to the fact that we have already taken action that the closing services should be here, and this other resolution was introduced without any motion to reconsider. It seems to me that, according to strict parliamentary usage, the resolution agreeing to go to Calvary Church was not properly presented to this House, and was not really passed. There was no reconsideration of the previous vote.

Rev. Dr. GEER, of New York. I wish to say that the New York delegation were quite unaware that this action was to take place. This morning I was consulted by one who came to me representing the very kind desire of the rector of Calvary Church that we should hold our closing services there. I objected, and said that if we left this Church we should accept the invitation of the rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity. I was in favor of remaining in this church, and was instrumental in causing, as far as I could, the rejection of the offer from the rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, because I felt that it was due that we should hold our concluding services here. I was surprised on coming in to-day to find that action had been taken to go from this Church, which I regretted very much, and to go to Calvary Church. I fully agree with the proposition of my colleague, that if we are to go from this Church, we should under the circumstance go to the Church of the Holy Trinity in Forty-second street.

Rev. Dr. HASKINS, of Long Island. In this matter it seems to me we must follow the House of Bishops. The House of Bishops have chosen their place, and let us obey their voice.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania. Had the rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity been here at the time, undoubtedly the Bishops would have selected that Church; but it was a very sudden thing; it was about the time of giving notices for the afternoon papers when the House of Bishops sent their action here, and we concurred with them rather than draw them here on election-day when they did not want to come. All arrangements have been made for Calvary Church, as to music and in other respects; and I will take this occasion to say to the members of the Convention that the middle aisle is reserved for them, the front seats for Deputies, and the rear ones for their families and friends.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Long Island. I am told that there is abundance of time to correct the notice in the papers, and that there is nothing really in the way of our meeting in Holy Trinity Church this evening; and considering what has been said in regard to the unanimous wish of this Body and the Deputation of the Diocese of New York, it seems to me we shall be guilty of a great discourtesy if we do not accept the invitation of the Church of the Holy Trinity.

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I wish to add a word. I heard the other day this invitation brought in from the rector of Holy Trinity Church. We then all agreed that it was best to have our closing services here; but when we cannot have them here, or when it is desirable to the House of Bishops to have them elsewhere, it seems to me eminently proper that we should accept the invitation so courteously extended to us, because I believe when invitations are extended it is always the way

of gentlemen to take the first one that comes. That came to us, and came to us in a very handsome manner some days ago. Inasmuch as we are told that it is not too late to perform this act of courtesy, I hope that we may do it.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. Is it possible to make the change of notice for the papers in time?

Rev. Dr. LEEDS, of Maryland. I am told it can be corrected in the last edition. The fourth edition of the afternoon papers will come out in time.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. If such is the case, I think it is clearly our duty to reconsider the resolution adopted this morning, and go to the Church of the Holy Trinity as a matter of common decency to the rector of that church, who has courteously proffered the use of it to us; and that can be done if it is still in time to send notice to the papers. I would say, while I am up, that if it is not done, and if it is found to be impossible, I think it should be the duty of the gentlemen who represent that Committee here to frame a resolution thanking the rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, and explaining the reasons why the invitation was not accepted.

Rev. Dr. SMEDES, of North Carolina. Are we sure we can now get the Church of the Holy Trinity? ["Yes."]

The SECRETARY. I am authorized by the Agent of the Associated Press to state that if he can command the services of one of the pages here, as of course he can, he can have the correction put in the afternoon papers in time.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. Then I insist on my motion to save time.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I will state that information has gone abroad throughout the city that our services are to be held in Calvary Church, and it would lead to infinite confusion if we depart from the order which we have already taken.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I move that the deputation from New York confer informally with the House of Bishops, and express the wish that we hold the services in the Church of the Holy Trinity, if agreeable to them; and if they agree to that we will make it all right.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of Mr. Montgomery.

The motion was agreed to.

RESIDENCE OF THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Convention to a matter which came up on the fifteenth day of the session, Friday, October 23, with reference to the canonical residence of Professors connected with Theological Seminaries. Those who have THE DAILY CHURCHMAN and will turn to page 102 will find the matter as it was then presented. Allow me to read it. There was reported by the Committee on Canons this resolution:

"Resolved, That this House concurs in the amendment of Subsection 4, Section 7, of Canon 12, Title I, proposed by the House of Bishops in Message No. 18."

The Canon is on page 55 of the Digest.

Judge Sheffey on the part of the Committee remarked:

"The Canon as it stands provides that it shall be the duty of all ministers to obtain and present letters of transfer as above, whenever they remove from one Diocese or Missionary Jurisdiction to another, with the exception of Professors in the General Theological Seminary, officers of the Board of Missions, and professors in colleges and universities which are established by the concurrent action of two or more Dioceses associated for that purpose.

The object is that the professors of the University of the South shall not be registered as ministers of the Diocese of Tennessee, but shall retain their domicile and the right of ministerial domicile in their respective Dioceses."

In behalf of the Deputy from Minnesota [Rev. Dr. Kidney], I would move an amendment. The matter was brought to an end, I think, irregularly. It was not acted upon, but dropped just there. There was an amendment further, drawn up by Judge Sheffey, and which presented the subject-matter in these words:

"But whenever a Diocese is divided into two or more Dioceses, any Professor in a Theological Seminary therein which is governed by trustees from every part of such original Dioceses, may select to which of said Dioceses he shall belong, and shall not be obliged to obtain and present the above-mentioned letters of transfer."

I would ask leave, if it be not in order otherwise, to bring up this matter and introduce the amendment.

The PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. What I wish to do is to insert in the original Canon an amendment to the effect that Professors in Theological Seminaries, where the Diocese has been divided, shall not be obliged to present these letters of transfer in the words I before read.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of an amendment to the Canon proposed by the Rev. Dr. Watson.

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

THANKS TO POSTMASTER, ETC.

Mr. DAYMUDE, of Iowa. Some resolutions of thanks have been passed. I offer the following:

"Resolved, That the thanks of this House are hereby tendered to the Hon. Thomas L. James, Postmaster of this city, and to the Hon. William Orton, President of the Western Union Telegraph Company, for mail and telegraphic facilities provided for the use of the members of the Convention, and also to Messrs. Chas. Crawford and Geo. W. Lockhart for their efficient agency in these matters."

The resolution was agreed to.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. The resolution I offered in reference to the adjournment this evening, held in obedience, I suggest that we pass it, leaving the name of the church blank. I move that the resolution be passed leaving the name of the Church blank, to be filled up as the House may hereafter order.

"Resolved, That when this House adjourn this afternoon, it be to half-past seven o'clock this evening, at — Church, and that after the religious services, including the reading of the Pastoral Letter, this House do stand finally adjourned."

The resolution was agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF PASTORAL LETTER.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. I now offer the following:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of this House take order for the publication of the Pastoral Letter, and for its immediate distribution to the clergy of the Church."

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McWHORTER, of Central New York. I ask whether the amended Digest is published with the Journal as of course, or whether a resolution is necessary?

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. I will state that the resolution reported by the Committee on the reduction of the size and expense of the Journal provides that no reduction shall take place so as to prevent there being sent to every clergyman and candidate for Orders a copy of the Constitution and Canon of the Church. In regard to the Pastoral Letter, I will state that measures have already been taken whereby it will be in the hands of every clergyman of this Church, except those in Oregon and California, before next Sunday.

"CHURCHMAN" DEBATES.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I offer the following resolution, which is a copy of one passed at the last Convention:

"Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to procure from Messrs. M. H. Mallory & Co. copies of the bound volume of the debates of this House sufficient to place ten in the archives of the Convention, to send one to each Bishop of the Church, one to each of the Dioceses, one to the Library of each Theological Seminary and College of the Church, and ten additional copies to be presented to the several Bishops and others recently visiting the Convention."

The resolution was agreed to unanimously.

SEATS OF MEMBERS.

Rev. Dr. HUNTINGTON, of Massachusetts, offered the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that the seats of the various deputations to the General Convention ought to be assigned by lot."

CLOSING EXERCISES.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I have no knowledge on the subject of a message from the House of Bishops in regard to the closing services, but some of my colleagues have understood that we are to receive some such communication. I think it should have been here by this time if it were true that we were to receive any. I will simply, therefore, state that the purpose of the change was solely on reasons of convenience. The Bishops have had offers of several churches in the city, and they concluded to go to Calvary Church because it is central, and to leave this Church because they understand that, this being the night of the general election day, we might be disturbed in our devotions in this place.

Rev. Dr. AYRAULT, of Central New York. I move, then, that the name of Calvary Church be inserted in the blank left in the resolution of the Deputy from Long Island.

The PRESIDENT. That will be done as a matter of course.

COMMISSION ON THE CONSTITUTION.

A message (No. 107) from the House of Bishops announced the adoption by that House of the following resolution:

"Resolved (the House of Deputies concurring), That a Joint Committee be appointed to report to the next General Convention on the expediency of creating a joint commission to revise the Constitution of this Church, and also to report a plan for the construction and direction of such Commission, provided they shall approve of such a measure."

Rev. Dr. DE KOVEN, of Wisconsin. I move that we concur.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. That subject was before the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution, and expressly reported against unanimously, and the report approved by this House.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. Permit me to correct the gentleman. It was not in regard to a

committee to enquire into the propriety of appointing a commission. What was before this House and what was voted down was a proposition that we were ready now to go into the appointment of a commission; but this proposition is simply to raise a Committee to report to the next General Convention upon the propriety of raising a joint commission, and if the report be in favor of the propriety of such a commission, then to report a plan for raising it.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. I move that we non-concur in the message of the House of Bishops. It is quite too late to act now.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. The Diocese of Albany, to which I belong, passed a resolution unanimously in favor of that idea, and instructed her Deputies on this floor to do everything in their power to see that it was carried into effect. As this is a Joint Commission, one that will have time enough, we need be in no danger. I confess I do not see the consistency with which our Rt. Rev. Fathers sent us down a few minutes ago a message that they could not appoint a joint commission in regard to Diocesan Synods because it was so late, and then send down this other thing, which is a much larger question, and really involves the other. That is an inconsistency for them to settle. I think it is a very happy inconsistency, especially the latter part of it, and I hope therefore we shall concur with their recommendation.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I hope we shall not concur. It involves the question whether our Constitution shall grow naturally by accretion in the mode prescribed by the Constitution, or whether by some new patent mode, by a Commission, the whole structure is to be pulled down from top to bottom. That whole question was attentively considered on our Committee, and it deserves the gravest consideration of this House whether we shall take the first initial step towards the demolition of our liberties.

The PRESIDENT. The first question is on the motion that we do not concur.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The first motion is to concur. If we do not concur, we non-concur. The motion was first made that we concur in the action of the House of Bishops.

The PRESIDENT. The second motion was made to non-concur.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The motion to concur is the proper one to put, and, of course, if it is voted down then we non-concur necessarily.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on the motion to concur with the message just read from the House of Bishops.

The motion to concur was not agreed to, there being on a division, ayes, 45; noes, 48.

CLOSING SERVICES.

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I am requested to read the following resolution adopted by the House of Bishops:

"Resolved, That while this House is grateful for the courteous offers which they have received from divers rectors in this city of their respective churches, for the closing services of this Convention, they adhere to their motion with respect to Calvary Church for reasons of convenience."

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I think it would be well to enter this resolution on the minutes.

The PRESIDENT. That would be well enough.

PREPARATIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. I move that a committee be appointed to inform the House of Bishops that we have completed our business and await messages from them.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed the Rev. Dr. Shelton, of Western New York, the Rev. Dr. Burgess, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pierrepont, of Long Island, as the Committee.

PRESIDENT CRAIK'S ADDRESS.

The PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, I suppose it would be well for me now, on behalf of my colleagues, the Officers of this House, to return you our thanks for your very complementary resolutions, and I cannot do so very well without expressing my own feelings of congratulations to you upon the patience and disinterestedness with which you have come up to your duty as expected by the Church, nobly, as it seems to me, you have done it.

There is an impression abroad that the Convention has been wasting its time because it has not been providing for the conversion of men for immediate action upon the mass of the community, forgetting that this is a legislative body, and that men cannot be converted by canons or joint resolutions; but you have done in that same direction noble work. You have elected five Missionary Bishops providing that this pastoral and missionary work, shall be done in the future far more efficiently than it has ever been done before; and this surely is a subject of most warm congratulation for the future of the Church, and for the recollection of that which we have been permitted to do here.

Then, again, for the better and truer execution of the divine work of the Church—the conversion of the world—you have, with a full recognition of the essential importance of zeal and enthusiasm as factor in that work, and with a full recognition of that conscience in a sacred thing, determined, nevertheless, that zeal without knowledge, and conscience without capacity to distinguish between truth and error, are not special qualifications for the ministry of this Church, for the office of teachers of the people. And again, you have maintained the broad toleration of this Church, a Church, as we hold, grandly comprehensive, like our Divine Master, tolerant of human infirmity, and of the inevitable confusions of the human mind; but you have likewise unmistakably resolved that false doctrine or the approach to it will not be encouraged, or endorsed directly or indirectly by this Church.

Now then, with these great questions settled, we go forth to the real practical work we are to meet, and in the power of the Holy Ghost, to overcome the old and the everliving and active external enemies of truth, enemies of God and of man alike—to meet and overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil, to set forward the salvation of all men. This is the grand practical work to which we go forth now, stronger I believe, more efficient, more resolved, and more earnest than we have ever been before.

Rev. Mr. LEVERETT, of Central Pennsylvania. Mr. Secretary, I move that the address of the President be entered on the Journal.

The Secretary put the question on the motion, and it was agreed to unanimously.

ACTION OF THE BISHOPS.

Rev. Dr. SHELTON, of Western New York. The Committee appointed to wait upon the House of Bishops have performed that duty, and the House of Bishops replied that they were not exactly ready to adjourn. They will be ready probably in the course of fifteen or twenty minutes.

Rev. Dr. BURGESS, of Massachusetts. They will send us down some more business in fifteen or twenty minutes.

FOREIGN CONGREGATION.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. There was an

amendment to the Constitution proposed in Message No. 97 of the House of Bishops sent down in my absence yesterday and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. The Committee on Constitutional Amendments has grown "small by degrees," and as it will be seen from those who are left, my brother from Texas for example, "beautifully less." There is no possibility of action therefore upon that or any other report. The proposed change is by adding an Article 2, which is a very valuable and very important article, and I have no doubt it will excite a great deal of serious attention. It seems to me we have nothing to do except to not occur. The article is one which proposes that persons of foreign race and tongue may have a certain coherency or unity in connection with this Church, and I suppose it will be a very valuable provision when it is passed. If the Convention is prepared to spend time in considering it, I would make a motion either to concur or not to concur, as the House chooses, and I think we can only not concur, and I would offer a resolution that we do not concur in Message No. 97.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. A motion to not concur is action. We are not prepared to approve or disapprove it at this time, and therefore let us lay it on the table.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Very well. I move that it be laid on the table.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. I beg to say that it is a very important and desirable amendment, and if we had time we might pass it, and omit the form of going through the Committee. Three of us have agreed to it on the Committee; all the members of the Committee who are here approve it.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I call for the reading of it.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. It is too serious a matter to be acted on now. This Church is a national Church, and is composed only of the people belonging to this nation. I am not yet prepared to say that a congregation in a foreign land should be received into our Church.

Mr. RUGGLES, of New York. We have populations speaking a variety of languages in this country. It is to bring in those large bodies of foreigners speedily and promptly.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Western New York. I should like to enquire what there is in the Constitution forbidding it now? Is there anything saying that they shall worship in the English language?

MESSAGES FROM THE BISHOPS.

A message (No. 108) was received from the House of Bishops asking for a Committee of Conference on Message No. 114 of the House of Deputies on the subject of the inhibition of an accused minister, and appointing as the conferees on its part the Bishop of North Carolina and the Bishop of Ohio.

A message (No. 109) from the House of Bishops announced its non-concurrence in Message No. 118 of the House of Deputies amending Message No. 12 of the House of Bishops relative to abandonment of the ministry.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. As to Message No. 108, the point is this: The House of Bishops ask that where a minister is put on his trial for immoral conduct, the Bishop of the Diocese shall have the right to suspend him from the exercise of his office until he has been tried. We think that is punishing him in advance before he is found guilty, and it involves a very serious question. The Committee on Canons reported against it. It seems to prejudice the case. It is a principle which has never been introduced into our Church in this country. It does exist in the Romish Church and some other Churches. I am not certain whether the power exists in the English Church or not. The view taken by the Com-

mittee on Canons was that it was prejudging the case to a certain extent, and that it was punishing a man before he was found guilty. We nonconcurring in the previous action of the House of Bishops, and they now ask for a Committee of Conference. I suppose we ought to agree to the request for a Committee of Conference.

The PRESIDENT. Of course.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. I should like to ask one question before we act further on this matter: Whether it would not be in the power of a Bishop under those circumstances to inhibit the man, and then to embarrass or delay the trial so that it should never come off; whether the result might not be that a man might be suspended simply by the act of the Bishop, without any chance to be tried?

Rev. Dr. CLARK, of New Jersey. There is another question in relation to that. Perhaps some legal gentleman can answer it. It is whether the Bishop would not render himself liable to prosecution for libel in a case of that sort? It is the most extraordinary proceeding ever heard of in any legislative body whatever, to propose that a man shall be condemned before he is tried, cut off from the exercise of the privileges of his office, simply because somebody may suspect him of something, charge him with something, and, before he has had an opportunity to be heard, that he shall have the punishment inflicted upon him of suspension from the duties of his office. I hope, sir, that this message will not be concurred in, and that no committee of conference will be appointed looking to any such legislation as this.

Mr. ROCKWELL, of Central Pennsylvania. It seems to me we have no right to say that we shall refuse the conference the Bishops ask for. They may have some other proposition to make, and it would seem to me entirely proper for us to agree to the conference.

The PRESIDENT. I think, according to the usages of the House, we are bound to appoint a Committee of Conference when it is asked for.

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. I have no objection to a Committee of Conference.

The PRESIDENT. It is moved that a Committee of Conference be appointed.

The motion was agreed to, and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Watson, of North Carolina, and Mr. Otis, of Illinois, as the conferees on the part of the House of Deputies.

Rev. Dr. HALL, of Long Island. Would it be proper to instruct the Committee?

The PRESIDENT. I think not.

Mr. OTIS, of Illinois. I wish the Chair would double the number. Dr. Watson and myself have already expressed our opinions.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will add Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island, and Mr. Burgwin, of Pittsburgh, to the Committee.

THANKS TO ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I wish leave to add to the resolution passed a short time ago—what I think was omitted by oversight—thanks to the Secretary and his assistants.

The PRESIDENT. I thought that was provided for.

Rev. Dr. SCHENCK, of Long Island. No; the resolution I offered was especially in reference to Dr. Perry. I should be glad to have any one else offer an additional resolution.

Mr. SMITH, of South Carolina. I move that the thanks of this body be returned to the Assistant Secretaries for the care and fidelity with which they have discharged their duties.

The motion was agreed to unanimously.

ABANDONMENT OF THE COMMUNION.

A message (No. 110) was received from the House of Bishops as follows:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it non-concurs in Message No. 110 of the House of Deputies amending Message No. 29 from the House of Bishops as to the amendment of Canon 8, Title II., and asks for a Committee of Conference; and the House of Bishops has appointed as such Committee the Bishops of North Carolina, New York, and Ohio.

On motion, a Committee of Conference was ordered to be appointed, and the President appointed Rev. Dr. Watson, of North Carolina; Rev. Dr. Hall, of Long Island; Mr. Otis, of Illinois, and Mr. Burgwin of Pittsburgh, the conferees on the part of the House of Deputies.

A message (No. 111) was received from the House of Bishops, as follows:

"The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it concurs in Message No. 111, from the House of Deputies, amending the amendment proposed by this House to Section 1, of Canon 2, of Title II., of the Digest; and also concurs in Message No. 106, from the House of Deputies, with this amendment, that after the word 'specifying,' be inserted the words 'as far as possible.'"

Rev. Dr. BEACH, of New York. I move that that amendment be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORTS.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. The Committee of Conference report that upon the question of discipline, Canon 2 of Title II., where it was proposed to inhibit clergymen charged with crime or immorality pending the investigation of the matter, that the House of Bishops recede from their action, leaving us to stand to our own. That is one report.

The same Committee also report, in reference to Canon 8 of Title II.:

"The Committee of Conference on the part of this House report that we concur with the House of Bishops in changing the word 'may,' in the thirteenth line of that Canon, to the word 'shall.' We had proposed an amendment that it should be 'may' instead of 'shall.' The House of Bishops insisted on retaining the word 'shall,' and our own Committee report in favor of concurring in their action."

Rev. Mr. HOPKINS, of Albany. Just as it stands now?

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. Just as it stands now.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. The Canon will come down from the Bishops in a few moments as they propose it, and thus by simply concurring with them, we have the Canon passed. Perhaps I ought to explain the matter further.

The Bishops first sent down to us a Canon in which they made provision for inhibiting a minister during the pendency of his trial. The Committee on Canons reported and recommended the House to non-concur, and we did non-concur and sent that action to the Bishops. They sent down a message that they adhered to their previous action, and asked for the appointment of a Committee of Conference. We now have the report of that Committee, advising us to adhere to our original action of non-concurrence with the Bishops. I move now that we approve of the action of the Committee of Conference, and adhere to our former vote of non-concurrence.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURGWIN, of Pittsburgh. On the other matter it is not necessary for us to act, because the Bishops will send down a Canon in a few minutes,

according to the report we have agreed to, and then it will only be necessary to concur in their action.

Rev. Dr. WATSON, of North Carolina. I think it better that we put the question on this House receding from its amendment substituting "may" for "shall" in Canon 8, of Title II.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on agreeing to the report of the Committee of Conference.

The report was agreed to.

A message (No. 112) was received from the House of Bishops announcing its concurrence in the amendment proposed to Canon 8 of Title II. of the House of Deputies in Message No. 110 under the numbers 2 and 3 respectfully.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

The PRESIDENT. The Secretary will now read his rough minutes of to-day's session.

The rough minutes were read and approved.

CLOSE OF BUSINESS.

Rev. Dr. POTTER (Secretary of the House of Bishops), appeared and delivered the following message:

The Secretary of the House of Bishops is instructed to say to the House of Deputies that the House of Bishops has no further communication to make to this House.

Rev. Dr. GEER, of New York. I move that the House now take a recess to meet at Calvary Church at half-past seven o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOSING SERVICES.

The House resumed its session at half-past seven o'clock, at Calvary Church.

The Bishops having entered the Chancel in their Episcopal robes, Evening Prayer was said to the Psalter by the Right Rev. Benjamin Wistar Morris, D.D., Bishop of Oregon. The Psalter was said by the Right Rev. T. B. Lyman, D.D., Assistant Bishop of North Carolina. The First Lesson was read by the Right Rev. B. H. Paddock, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts. The Second Lesson was read by the Right Rev. W. B. M. Howe, D.D., Bishop of South Carolina. The Creed and Prayers were said by the Right Rev. Edward R. Welles, D.D., Bishop of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING BISHOP (Rt. Rev. Benjamin Bosworth Smith, D.D., Bishop of Kentucky). My dear Brethren: The assembling of our General Convention never before elicited such warm attention on the part of the faithful. It is very comforting to know that it probably never was preceded by so many and such earnest prayers—prayers to God that His presence might be with us, and His blessing and peace rest upon us. If we can judge by fruits, we think we have reason to say that peace, harmony and good feeling have pervaded the proceedings of both Houses to an extent never perhaps before experienced, although in this respect the blessings of God have always attended our deliberations. Upon this we congratulate you, my dear brethren, before we part, rendering thanks to Almighty God for His great mercies, and imploring you to continue to offer up your prayers, that a blessing may descend upon all the decisions at which we have arrived under His blessed guidance.

In response to your request, a Pastoral Letter has been prepared, and will soon be delivered in your hearing by our brother, the Bishop of Easton. Since the preparation of it an event has occurred amongst us which we think will be memorable from this time forth—the election by the House of Bishops of a foreign Bishop of the colored race for the Island of Hayti, and we trust that in the good providence of God he will be consecrated to that

great work on next Sunday. We commend this action on the part of the House of Bishops and the candidate to your fervent prayers.

Rt. Rev. ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, D.D., Bishop of Western New York. Brethren, the Presiding Bishop has desired me also to say that in his opinion the event which has just been announced is one of so extraordinary a character, and has been consummated under such peculiar circumstances, that it is desirable there should be a response—not a response in the way of a vote, but in the way of thanks to Almighty God, that the Church has been brought, in the blessing of God, to that period in her history when it has become a Mother Church, and when one of the African race, for the first time in all history, has been elected to be sent forth by her, to be the first Bishop of an Island Church, and of a people long afflicted and distressed. These were circumstances which, in his opinion, and that of many of his brethren, called for our thanksgiving to Almighty God, and I propose that it shall be offered in the form of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. ["Amen."]

The *Gloria in Excelsis* was sung, after which the Pastoral Letter was read by the Right Rev. Henry Champlin Lay, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Easton, as follows:

BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY AND LAITY:

Within the three years which have elapsed since the Bishops of the Church addressed you by Pastoral Letter, not a few of our number have been released from their earthly ministries. The late Bishops of Ohio, of Massachusetts, and of Illinois no longer assist in our counsels, which they were wont largely to influence. The late Bishop of Indiana, after years of suffering and weary sickness, has found rest; while his brother of Iowa was taken suddenly away by casualty in the midst of labors. The blind Bishop of South Carolina has passed, we humbly trust, from darkness into light, and Armistage, almost the Benjamin of our House, fell sweetly on sleep while it was yet day. Our Missionary Episcopate has lost in Bishop Randall one whose career was marked by energy and self-devotion. Africa has laid beneath the sod her Missionary Bishop Auer, just as he sought to set the battle in array, while we hear in the midst of our deliberations that the veteran Payne, who preceded him, has found his grave in Virginia beside the tomb of his fathers.

Most suggestive is this roll-call of departed brethren, so various in gifts and age, in the work given them while they lived, and the manner of the death appointed them to die? Very fragrant is the memory of their Christian virtues, and well-assured our hope that, in the day which shall try every man's work of what sort it is, they shall find mercy and the reward of grace.

The reports which have come before us afford gratifying evidence of even and steady progress throughout the whole Church. Besides the mere increase of numbers, there is expansion and growth in the agencies designed to seek Christ's sheep, and to keep them from harm. New Dioceses have been erected, additional Missionary Bishops have been appointed, Christian Schools are established. Today, more than ever in this Church, men and women are rendering to God their personal service—not merely sending others, but going themselves to seek the lost, to instruct the young, and to nurse the sick.

We desire in this place to express our sense of the exceeding value of the "woman's work" that has been done in the Church, and to encourage its more extended efforts. Whether in the way of organized charitable associations, or of Deaconesses, or of Sisterhoods, it is now proven by actual results that women can do much in relieving the sorrowful,

in reclaiming the vicious, and in upholding the hands of the heralds of the cross. We cheerfully recognize as helpers in the Lord the faithful women of our communion who show themselves succorers of many.

We have, with the concurrence of the Clerical and Lay Deputies, restricted the jurisdiction of our Foreign Missionary Bishop at Yeddo to the Empire of Japan, and we propose, if God will, to consecrate another Bishop for the work in China, and yet another to preside over our Missions in Africa. Measures have been devised to place the infant Church in Hayti on an assured basis. At home, four new Missionary Episcopates have been created for Northern Texas, for Western Texas, for Northern California, and for New Mexico and Arizona. All these deserve vigorous support, and will require enlarged contributions. It is ours to send the officers to the front. It is yours to supply them helpers, and to laud them with such things as are necessary to prosecute their work. And let us seek to realize that it is God the Holy Ghost alone who enlightens, guides, sustains, and sanctifies the Church, and let us pray that our Churches at home and abroad, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of that Holy One, may be edified and multiplied.

Besides this external growth of the Church, we have reason to believe that there is a higher sense among many of our people of the saintliness of their Christian calling, and a yearning after a more complete conformity to the likeness of the Pure and Holy One. We note with much satisfaction the wide circulation of books by living writers which treat of the life of God in the soul of man, and the large demand for the well-worn manuals of devotion which have come down to us from our Anglican doctors. We may not forget that there is danger in the very restlessness of our religious activities, without these correctives of quiet meditation, and personal communion with the Father of all spirits.

In contrast with these encouragements stands out the fact that the supply of candidates for Holy Orders is now inadequate to meet the demand created by the organization of new congregations. And, more than this, but a small proportion of those who are admitted candidates are self-supporting. We entreat you to ponder well these pregnant statements. The priest's office is not coveted by the many; nay, it is avoided by too many of the ingenuous and favored youth of the country, whose parents are able to give them an unrestricted choice of profession.

If this indisposition to consecrate one's self or his children to the work of the ministry be due to the greed of wealth, to the delusion that the accumulation of an estate is, of right, the controlling influence in the selection of our work on earth, then we declare to you, in the name of the living God, that this is covetousness, which is idolatry; this is to pervert the great design of life, and to revolt against the very first condition of Christian service, "Make ready wherewith I may sup; and gird thyself and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken, and afterward thou shalt eat and drink." Woe to the Christian youth who, as he stands where the paths of life diverge, enquires only which of these will lead most assuredly to gain and to promotion, instead of asking meekly, and first of all, "Show me the way that I should walk in," and woe to the father who when his son's eyes are moistened with compassion for the multitude, seeks to distract his attention and disturb his judgment by obtruding on his sight a vision of earthly greatness. We believe that many a young life has been clouded by this irreparable error in its beginning, either of not asking for a word from the Lord, or else of

grieving the Spirit of God whispering in his heart the admonition, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." Pray ye, the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into His harvest. Look ye out, men and brethren, look ye out among you men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. Lend unto the Lord, father or mother, the goodliest of your young men, "even thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest." We set this our earnest exhortation in the first place. With unanimous consent, and with all the urgency we can bring to this our official counsel, we entreat clergy and people to take away the reproach which must be ours while the children ask the bread of life, and there is no man that breaketh it unto them.

Too often the Confirmation of our youths is deferred until it is too late so much as to consider the claims of the sacred ministry at all. We do not advise that any be hastily brought to this holy ordinance, without careful instruction and self-scrutiny and earnest prayer to God. But we urge that in the just discharge of parental responsibility, you should encourage your sons as well as your daughters early to renew their covenant with God, and to make it a part of their self-consecration to choose their vocation in life according to His will, and not their own mere natural predilection.

The passion of the age in which we live is Freedom. Its favorite watchword is Liberty. Noble words are these if we use them in their true significance. We purpose in this Pastoral to admonish you of the Glorious Liberty which ye have as covenanted children of God, and to exhort you that ye hold it fast. If the Son hath made you free, then are ye free indeed; free to believe all that is true and nothing that is false, free to love all that is lovely and nothing that is evil; free to do all that is right and nothing that is wrong; free to covet all that is noble and naught that is vile. Such is Christian Liberty, a freedom with limitations indeed, but limited in those respects only wherein the absence of restraint would be but another name for vassalage and cruel bondage. We desire to illustrate the true meaning of the Christian Liberty whereof we speak in three several instances:

1. The Faith you profess.
2. The Obedience you render; and
3. The Love which should animate your service.

1. The Liberty of Christian Faith.

Have faith in God is the first precept of our holy religion. Confide in Him personally, the wise and gracious One, as implicitly as a child believes in his Father. Believe His every spoken word, His instruction, His warning, and His promise; for without such faith it is impossible to please Him. But belief is neither blind credulity nor enforced assent. God has His witnesses in nature and in providence, and by the mouth of these many witnesses it is proven that the Lord is loving unto every man, and His mercy is over all His works. In a higher sense, faith comes by hearing, and relies upon that manifestation of the truth which commends itself to reason and to conscience. The sanctified intellect delights to explore every department of knowledge, to decipher the strange legend impressed upon the once fluid rock, to unroll the papyrus, to analyze the mysterious processes of human thought and consciousness. But none the less are we free to recognize eternal truths, and, unappalled by mysteries or seeming contradictions, to affirm the verity of the Christian story, which it is unreasonable to deny.

But who knows not the presence of an arrogant scepticism which, in view of our glorious liberty of believing that God is love and that His Son hath died, points at us the finger of derision as submit-

ting to an intellectual bondage which dares not turn toward the light?

The Church seeks not to put out the eyes of scholars and investigators. She gladly welcomes all their contributions to human knowledge and to the wealth of human thought. But she warns her children, in the presence of these "little systems" which "have their day and cease to be," that they must not enslave themselves to the tyranny of transient theories, and forego their right to hold fast that which is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.

Remember, Brethren, that the religion which we profess is a religion of fact. The Creed you recite is a rehearsal of events that have happened in the olden days, and of hopes surely founded thereon.

Our religion rests upon a historical basis as impregnable as when St. Paul at Thessalonica for three Sabbath-days reasoned out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ.

The mere history of the successive philosophers which have held sway in the intellectual world, is of itself a laborious study, and the discovery of revolutionary facts is constantly demanding the readjustment of hypothesis and theory. It is because the faith is sure and certain that its utterances cannot be always made to harmonize with the half-known and the variable.

It is Freedom, not servitude, to hold fast the faith once delivered to the Saints.

The Church has no quarrel with science. Far from it. She ever welcomes science as her ally and her friend. Her quarrel is not with science, but with science falsely so called.

We warn you against the pretentious dogmatism, and especially against the atheistic materialism, which under the name of science presents, not its discoveries and its facts, but crude theories and tentative speculations. The long-exploded errors of the past are thus, like ghosts, rising from their graves, and seeking to resume their empire over human thought and human conduct, tempting men to revive a species of Paganism, and miscall it "the Advance of Science."

2. The Liberty of Christian Discipline.—Almighty God has been pleased to give us, not only Faith, but a discipline as well. Ye are free, and yet the Lord's freedmen. Admitted to the General Assembly and Church of the first born, ye are set in authority and under authority, set to rule over those whom God has confided to you, and admonished in turn to obey them that are over you in the Lord, and to submit yourselves to their just authority.

And this appointed discipline is Liberty, not Bondage. It is Liberty to be the members of a great army, instead of lonely adventurers—soldiers with a claim for guidance, protection, and sympathy, with a right to demand your place beneath the shade and beside the wells of every Elim where the army finds its camp; it is Liberty to have over you in the Lord men who have not dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy, who preach Christ Jesus the Lord and themselves your servants for Jesus' sake, joying and rejoicing if they be offered up upon the sacrifice and service of your faith.

The Divine Master is considerate of our self-respect. He calls us, not servants, but friends. He, and His Church following His directions, have no secrets to hide from obedient and humble minds; no arbitrary rules, no minute prescriptions to bind upon the faithful.

What shall we say to these things? Shall we, because we are friends, cease to be dutiful? Shall we, because we are under grace rather than law, scant our obedience, and betray the Master's honor that is confided to us? As the very boldness with which

we may come to the throne of grace obliges us to profounder reverence, so the large freedom we enjoy in all the details of life and duty furnishes the highest argument for circumspection and self-control.

Our clergy have large liberty: shall they abuse the gentleness of Christ and the patience of their mother, by pressing their own fancies and self-conceits to the utmost verge of canonical endurance? Shall they usurp the functions of the body that commissions them, and seek to make that Church more Evangelical or more Catholic than her own formularies and Ritual affect to be? When men asked John Baptist, Who art thou? he answered, in effect, that he was nobody; a voice in the wilderness, the mere breath of a divine utterance. How glorious is the Liberty, how high the privilege, of the clergy, to refrain from all self-assertion, to utter that only which God and His Church put into their mouths, and to afford the most signal example of that obedience of faith which obeys law because it is the law.

It is a part of the Liberty wherewith Christ has made us free to lift up all our domestic life into the pure atmosphere of spiritual thought and feeling. Marriage is no longer a union of convenience, or a matter of civil contract. It is the one blessed heirloom transmitted from the days of innocence, it is the type and emblem of that union which is betwixt Christ and the Church. The freedom of the chaste, pure, Christian home stands pre-eminent among the earthly blessings bestowed on us in Christ.

How is it, then, that some among you have presumed to put away a wife except for the cause of fornication? We are distressed to know that some, under pretext of a civil divorce, have without adequate cause dismissed an uncongenial wife or husband, and after marrying another, have profaned the holy sacrament by coming to it with a body thus defiled.

Be ye well assured, brethren beloved, that whatever license may be tolerated by society and by civil courts, if any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful. Be admonished that if any cleave not to his wife, but unlawfully marries another, and then comes to the table of the Lord, although he doth carnally and visibly press with his teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise is he partaker of Christ, but rather, to his own condemnation doth eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

In your freedom yet again, you are not under minute direction or prohibition concerning the manner of employing the Lord's day, the observances of domestic piety, the participation in amusements, or the accumulation of gain. Much trusted in all these particulars, how studious should you be to make the day of rest and praise honorable and holy, to maintain all the sanctities of the Christian home to avoid frivolity and riot, and to take care that charity as well as justice restrain you in asking all your dues, or in seeking your lawful profit!

We tell you plainly that in these particulars some among you are greatly to be blamed. Whether it be due to the influence of a laxity of opinion imported among us from abroad, or to the demoralization of Continental travel, or to the want of lively interest in holy things, so it is that the Lord's Day is perverted from its sacred uses of rest and worship, while in many homes, throughout the week, no voice of prayer is heard at morning and at evening, and even the daily bread is eaten without mention of God, the giver. Sadly do we need in all the land a revival of domestic piety, so that by family devotions, and the right use of the first day of the week, our homes may be kept clean and pure.

Especially do we admonish you against that lax-

ity of morals which tolerates the participation by Christian men and women in amusements which outrage decency and inevitably soil the purity of those who share in them.

We specify plainly the numerous indecencies which are enacted on the stage, and the improper familiarity which characterizes some, not all, of the amusements of the social circle. Let our men value their own purity of thought, and our maidens believe that modesty is now, as of old, an ornament, not a disgrace. And think not because you avoid the profanation of the Lord's Day and licentious shows and immodest dances, that all is well with you. There is a temptation, and a fearful one, to license of another sort: that unrestraint of the lust of gain which leads to usury and extortion—to gambling speculation, instead of honest toil. For such things just as certainly as for folly and dissipation, God will surely call us into judgment.

Before passing to other considerations, we can but pause and revert again to the importance, if we would rear up a generation of saintly men and women, of teaching children to show piety at home. Catechising by the clergy is a most valuable function of their holy office, and Sunday-schools and Bible Classes, under their supervision and direction, are useful agencies in training the young. But neither Pastor nor teacher, however skilful, may exonerate the parent from his own responsibility. Christian fathers and mothers may not withdraw from a duty which they are so specially fitted to discharge. They must be at pains themselves to instruct their children in the truths of religion and to assist them by their counsels and encouragements in the trials of their young Christian life. In the department of experimental and personal religion, the parent who is loved and trusted by the child, and who in turn is well acquainted with the temper and disposition of the child, has it in his power to impart, howbeit in artless and untheological phrase, the most valuable lessons of holy wisdom and of practical godliness.

Nor should religious education be arrested here. A long-established Canon reminds the Clergy, and the same duty is after their manner binding on the laity in their more limited spiritual cures, "that they shall not only be diligent in instructing the children in the catechism, but shall also, by stated catechetical lectures and instruction, be diligent in informing the youth and others in the Doctrines, Constitution, and Liturgy of the Church." For the Church maintains the Faith in its purity and integrity as taught in the Holy Scriptures held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils; her Constitution, attested by Holy Scripture and ancient authors, she has not invented, but inherited from the days of old; her Liturgy was moulded by the breath of many saintly men. Your children should know the value of these precious gifts, and the grounds on which we receive and love them. In an age of indifference, when so many seek to reduce all religion to a sentiment, it is cruel to expose a child to the solicitations of variant systems of belief and practice without a knowledge of the origin and history of the Church of Christ, and an intelligent understanding of the authority on which she relies for her doctrine and order.

3. And lastly, we would admonish you of the precious Liberty of Love. We are not under the rule, This do, or thou shalt die, but Love is the fulfilling of the law. We are free to love God with all our hearts, and the more we love Him the more Glorious is our Liberty.

It becomes us not to ask whether He will be content with less or more. He has given us blessing without stint, and we should render Him back love without measure. "The Son of God loved me and

gave himself for me." We love Him who first loved us. With such thoughts in our hearts, obedience is liberty, and trials become sweet, and the humblest offering finds its rich reward. The thought of God's love for sinners is the healing leaf which can sweeten the bitterest fountain at which we are called to drink.

The Christian soul is sensitive to the love of God and loves all things in Him and for His sake. It loves even the dumb creatures He has made, because He condescends to be the God of the sparrow, and considered the very cattle that were in Nineveh. Gentleness to the animals which serve us, protection to the dependent flock which typifies the chosen people of the Lord, pity for the callow brood in the fragile nest, are lessons which men of love are not ashamed to impress upon themselves and upon their children. Let us love the Church and lavish on it the very best we have. Men may ask in scorn, What is thy beloved more than another beloved? but we know Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, and that she is His bride and the mother of His children.

Let us love the stranger and the fatherless, the poor and him that hath no helper; let us love the vicious and the unlovely for the sake of that Love in whose image they were created; nor let us be unmindful of the new commandment, that we Christians love one another, with pity, with courtesy, with patience, in honor preferring one another, forbearing one another in love.

"Christ has founded His Church upon love." Thus wrote one of our Bishops in a day of strife and discord. "It is the highest of Christian graces." Now abideth Faith, Hope and Charity—these three, but the greatest of these is Charity. Charity! not mere almsgiving, which is only one of its manifestations, but Love—Christian Love. . . . A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another.

And this is truly not only the new commandment, but the summary of all the commandments.

The whole Gospel is redolent with it, with a broad, comprehensive, all-embracing love, appointed, like Aaron's rod, to swallow up all the other Christian graces, and to manifest the spiritual glory of God in Christ. A Church without love! What could you augur of a Church without Faith, or a Church of Christ without Hope? But Love is a higher grace than either Faith or Hope, and its absence from the Church is just the absence of the very life-blood from the body."

As these paternal counsels come to an end, we remember that ours is a ministry of consolation, and

that the Priests of the Lord are set to bless the people in the name of the Lord. Our hearts reach out after all the children of the Church throughout this wide land, and scattered in all the countries of the world, and we invoke upon you the benediction of peace.

May the blessing of God rest upon your homes, so that they shall be pure and happy, the very nurseries of a long line of kings and priests unto God; and upon your farms and your merchandise, your labors and your business, so that your cup may run over, abounding chiefly in that godliness with contentment which is great gain. May it rest upon your churches, so that they shall be to the sick houses of healing and to the great company of believers the very gate of heaven. May it abide upon the patient missionary, so that when most alone he shall not be alone; upon the bereaved, the sick, the dying, the tempted, and the friendless. May that blessing so abound that not one of you shall fall in the wilderness through unbelief, but that all may receive at last that sentence of which all earthly benediction is but the anticipation, the "Come, ye blessed children of my Father," which shall put away forever all sorrow and all fear.

We have it not in our hearts to restrain this our blessing to those only who are ready to accept it from us as from their fathers in the Lord. We remember the many with whom, alas! we are not in visible communion; the many whom we have reason to fear misunderstand us and count us not as partners; the many who, for lack of right guidance, have discarded most necessary articles of Christian belief, but who, even in their error, long for truth and light. On all such we invoke the grace that guides and the mercy that saves. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity!

While thus we reach out towards our children and our brethren the hand of benediction, we may not neglect to lift our eyes heavenward, and to ascribe all the glory and all the praise of our poor endeavors to Him who alone teacheth man wisdom and strengtheneth his hands for good.

BLESSING AND HONOR AND GLORY AND POWER BE UNTO HIM THAT SITTETH UPON THE THRONE, AND UNTO THE LAMB FOREVER AND EVER! AMEN.

The concluding prayers were said, and the Benediction was pronounced, by the Right Rev. Benjamin Bosworth Smith, D.D., Bishop of Kentucky.

The Bishops thereupon retired, and the President declared the House of Deputies adjourned *sine die*.

DATE DUE

~~MAY 12 1978~~

~~OCT 13 1978~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BX5820 .A3 1874

Episcopal Church. General
Convention (1874 : New York

Debates of the House of
deputies in the General co

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

11359

262.4
P945 gr
1874

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



00108353